

100-326671-24X

Declassification
authority derived from
FBI Automatic
Declassification Guide,
issued May 24, 2007

Screened by NARA (RD-F)
10-16-2018 FOIA # 58900
DOCID: 34277984

EXECUTIVE SESSION

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

Date March 21, 1951

ALTHEA ARCENEUX

520 MILLS BUILDING
WASHINGTON 6, D. C.

OFFICIAL REPORTER

TELEPHONE: WISCONSIN 5024

I N D E X

EXECUTIVE SESSION

March 21, 1951

- - -

Witness

Page

Larry Parks 1

Wednesday, March 21, 1951

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
Washington, D. C.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The Committee on Un-American Activities met in executive session at 4:00 p.m., in Room 226, Old House Office Building, Hon. John S. Wood (chairman) presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives John S. Wood (chairman), Francis E. Walter, Clyde Doyle, James B. Frazier, Jr., Harold H. Velde, Bernard W. Kearney, Donald J. Jackson, and Charles E. Potter.

Staff members present: Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., counsel; Louis J. Russell, senior investigator; William H. Wheeler, investigator; Thomas W. Beale, Sr., assistant counsel; and A. S. Poore, editor.

SWORN TESTIMONY OF LARRY PARKS

MR. WOOD: Mr. Parks, at the conclusion of the morning session the committee had a meeting, and it was the unanimous expression of the members of the committee that we were going to seek your further cooperation in an executive session, for further testimony that will not be publicized until such time, if at all, as the committee itself may deem expedient. It may never happen, but it is only fair to say to you that it is in the discretion of the committee at any time to make

public information that you may see fit to give in this executive session. Until such time, if it does happen, it will be kept in the confidential files of the committee.

With that statement, counsel will now propound additional questions.

MR. MANDEL: So that Mr. Parks will be fully aware of where he is going, is it the intention of the committee that unless he answers these questions in private, that is, in executive session, they intend to cite him for contempt of this committee.

MR. WOOD: The committee makes no threats.

MR. MANDEL: We haven't approached it as a matter of threat, just to clear his thinking so that he is fully informed in his own mind of the consequences of following that path.

MR. WOOD: Counselor, you have asked a question, and I will answer it as frankly as I can. The committee did not discuss that phase of it and hasn't discussed it. It is entirely possible, if Mr. Parks placed himself in the position here of being in contempt of Congress, that the committee may request a citation for that purpose. On the other hand, it may not. I cannot speak for the committee. Does that answer your question?

MR. MANDEL: No, not quite. I would like to spend another minute on it. I realize that, and I also realize the position

of the committee not to commit themselves to Mr. Parks, but in view of Mr. Parks' general attitude of being cooperative, and everyone easily understands here what is motivating him -- he feels so bad about what he has to do, and if he thought in his own judgment there was any chance at all that you would elicit from him information that was important to you, that he would very gladly give it to you voluntarily. It is only saving that little bit of something that you live with. You have to see and walk in Hollywood with that. You have to meet your children and your wife with it and your friends. It is that little bit that you want to save.

Although I don't want to ask the committee to commit itself, in fairness to Mr. Parks, he may have to sacrifice the arm with gangrene in order to save the body. Even though he doesn't like it, he will walk around the rest of his life without an arm.

I realize the purposes of this committee, and our attitude has been one of cooperation. We want to go right through with that. Now, if that is going to be the penalty that he eventually will have to pay, then I have to help him think a different way. I have to urge him a different way.

His honest and sincere opinion is that what he is going to give you will only eat up his insides and you will get nothing, no more than you have today. This is a conviction of this man.

MR. WOOD: Mr. Attorney, the committee has to be the judge of what information has pertinency and relevancy. It can't take the opinions of other people. I have tried to be frank about it, and the committee is very anxious -- I think you will agree -- to be considerate of this man. The committee is in no sense responsible for the position he finds himself in, but we are responsible for the position we find ourselves in. We have a responsibility and duty that is on us as public officials.

MR. MANDEL: I realize that.

MR. WOOD: I will be glad to answer any further inquiries.

MR. MANDEL: I realize that. I was wondering if I could get the opinion of the committee before, because the direction will have to come to him "If you don't answer, then we will cite you for contempt." I think that is part of the law, for the man to know the price. So it would have to come anyhow as a matter of law. I am urging it now so that I can sit down with him. I know how it is biting on the inside.

MR. WOOD: I am not going to put the committee in a position here, and I don't think any of them want to be placed in the position, of making any compromising statements about what they will do here in any given set of circumstances. I think they can cross that when they arrive at that point.

MR. MANDEL: I don't intend to argue with the committee any further. I believe I made my point.

MR. WOOD: Proceed, counsel.

MR. TAVENNER: Mr. Parks, are you acquainted with an effort made to raise funds for the New Masses magazine, which was in the form of a party held at the home of Frank Tuttle on June 8, 1945?

MR. PARKS: No, sir, I don't recall any such party at Frank Tuttle's house. I was at his house I believe only once, and as I remember it there were maybe two or three people, and it was purely a social evening. This is the best of my recollection. I don't believe to the very best of my recollection of attending such a party.

MR. TAVENNER: I have just learned there are two Frank Tuttles in Hollywood. Are you acquainted with that fact?

MR. PARKS: No. I only know one Frank Tuttle, who is a director in Hollywood.

MR. TAVENNER: He is the one that I had reference to.

MR. PARKS: That is the one that I am acquainted with, was acquainted with. I don't know whether he is out there now at this time.

MR. TAVENNER: Did you attend a Communist Party meeting of a cultural group of the Communist Party at the home of Hugo Butler?

MR. PARKS: I have been to Hugo Butler's house twice, I think. One was on a matter of -- I believe I read a script of his. The other time to the best of my recollection was a party given for -- as I recall, it was given for the people

who had come before your committee in 1947. This is the best of my recollection. I don't recall ever going to a party for— What was it? New Masses?

MR. TAVENNER: No. This party that I am speaking of now did not necessarily have anything to do with New Masses. This is a different meeting that I am referring to now at the home of Hugo Butler. It is alleged to have taken place on January 3, 1945.

MR. PARKS: No, I don't recall going there for a party at that time at all. I am being very honest when I say that. As I say, I know where he lives, and I think I have been there twice.

MR. TAVENNER: Was Hugo Butler a member of the Communist Party, to your knowledge, or from information made available to you?

MR. PARKS: No, sir, I have no knowledge of Hugo Butler at all being a member.

MR. TAVENNER: Did you ever attend a Communist Party meeting at which he was present?

MR. PARKS: Not to my recollection. I never did.

MR. TAVENNER: Was Frank Tuttle a member of the Communist Party, to your knowledge?

MR. PARKS: This, counsel, I do not know. I don't believe I have ever heard that. I don't believe that I have ever to the very best of my knowledge ever attended any.

meeting of such a nature with Frank Tuttle.

MR. TAVENNER: Who were the members of the cell of the Communist Party to which you were assigned during the period from 1941 on up to the time you dissociated yourself from the Party about 1945?

MR. PARKS: This is what I have been talking about. This is the thing that I am no longer fighting for myself, because I tell you frankly I am probably the completest ruined man that you have seen. I am fighting for a principle, I think, if Americanism involved in this particular case. This is what I have been talking about. I do not believe that it befits this committee to force me to do this. I do not believe it befits this committee or its purposes to force me to do this. This is my honest feeling about it. I don't think that this is fair play. I don't think it is in the spirit of real Americanism, as we know it. These are not people that are a danger to this country, gentlemen, the people that I knew. These are people like myself.

MR. TAVENNER: Mr. Chairman, if the witness refuses to answer the question, I see very little use in my asking him about other individuals.

MR. WOOD: The witness, of course, has got to make up his own mind as to whether he will or will not do it. It isn't sufficient, as far as this committee is concerned, to say that in your opinion it is unfair or un-American in the

proper administration of justice.

The question is: Do you refuse to answer or will you answer it?

MR. MANDEL: At this point I would like to ask the Chairman whether he is directing the witness to answer.

MR. WOOD: The witness has been asked. He must answer or decline to answer.

MR. MANDEL: I think a little more is needed. He must be directed to answer, and if he refuses to answer, just merely asking him and not going beyond, I don't believe under law is sufficient. I think he has to be directed and told "You have got to answer."

MR. WOOD: I don't understand any such rule, but in order to avoid any controversy I direct the witness to answer the question.

MR. PARKS: I do not refuse to answer the question, but I do feel that this committee is doing a really dreadful thing that I don't believe the American people will look kindly on. This is my opinion. I don't think that they will consider this as honest, just, and in the spirit of fair play.

MR. JACKSON: Mr. Chairman, might I interpose at this point? Mr. Parks, we are, each one of us, individually responsible to the American people. I think that our concept of our responsibility or of the extent to which we must answer

is a thing which we ourselves are fully conscious of. That determination must rest with the individual members of the committee and the committee as a whole. I for one resent having my duties pointed out to me.

MR. PARKS: I am not pointing the duty out.

MR. JACKSON: The inference is that we are doing something which is un-American in nature. That is a personal opinion of yours, and I merely think that it should be in the record. We have accountability for which we must account and for which we must answer.

MR. WOOD: The witness has said he doesn't refuse to answer, so I assume he is ready to answer.

MR. MANDEL: I may say this at this point: I think the committee and the individual members of the committee are all seeking within themselves to do the right thing. There is no question about that. I think in the same spirit, no one can, with the heritage that Mr. Parks has to uphold, think that he isn't as loyal as any member of this committee, individually or collectively, and that he in his own mind has to do the right thing as we Americans in our elections do and choose.

Of course, when the final gong goes down, he intends as he indicated to respect the will of this committee, but I think justly he reserves the right to talk to you gentlemen and possibly persuade you to think differently and express

his opinions.

MR. WOOD: The committee took the view, sir, that perhaps there might be some merit in your contention if we were still in an open hearing, but we are not. It is an executive session.

MR. MANDEL: I realize that, and I want to thank the committee for this consideration. I think it should have been done first before we started here, but this session is a very private session or executive session, which is very considerate of the committee, and the record should so state.

May I have a minute to talk to Mr. Parks?

MR. WOOD: Yes. You can retire if you like.

MR. MANDEL: I make this request of the committee. I want no promise from you, but just as a matter of finding what is the sportsmanlike attitude, that what he gives you will not be used in that way if it can be helped, without embarrassing these people in the same position he finds himself in today.

MR. WOOD: Nobody on this committee has any desire to smear the name of anybody. That isn't of benefit to this committee in the discharge of its duties. It has been a uniform custom of the committee since I have been connected with it. I think all American people who have viewed the work of the committee will agree with that.

MR. MANDEL: The reason I asked is because in the struggle that Mr. Parks is going through I think the internal struggle would go a little lighter, having that statement from you.

MR. TAVENNER: If you will just answer the question, please. The question was: Who were the members of the Communist Party cell to which you were assigned during the period from 1941 until 1945, or the period when you dissolved your membership with the Communist Party?

MR. PARKS: Well, Boris Carnovsky, Joe --

MR. TAVENNER: Will you spell that name?

MR. PARKS: I couldn't possibly spell it. Carnovsky, Joe Bromberg, Sam Rossen, Anne Revere, Lee Cobb.

MR. TAVENNER: What was the name?

MR. PARKS: Cobb. Gale Sondergaard, Dorothy Tree. Those are the principal names that I recall.

MR. TAVENNER: What was the name of Dorothy Trees' husband? Was it not Michael Uris?

MR. PARKS: Yes.

MR. TAVENNER: Was he a member?

MR. PARKS: Not to my knowledge.

MR. TAVENNER: Do you know whether Michael Uris was a member of any other cell of the Communist Party?

MR. PARKS: No. I don't know this at all.

MR. TAVENNER: I believe he was a writer, was he not, as distinguished from an actor?

MR. PARKS: I think he was a writer, yes.

MR. TAVENNER: The persons whose names you have mentioned were all actors?

MR. PARKS: Yes, that's correct.

MR. TAVENNER: Can you recall the names of others who were at one time a member of that cell?

MR. PARKS: That's about all I recall right now.

MR. TAVENNER: Was Howard Da Silva a member?

MR. PARKS: No, I don't believe that I ever attended a meeting with Howard Da Silva.

MR. TAVENNER: Was Howard Da Silva a member of the Communist Party, to your knowledge?

MR. PARKS: Not to my knowledge. To the best of my ability, I don't believe I ever attended a meeting with him, and I don't recall ever having attended a meeting with him.

MR. TAVENNER: Was Roman Bohman a member?

MR. PARKS: Yes.

MR. TAVENNER: He is now deceased, I believe.

MR. PARKS: He is dead.

MR. TAVENNER: Was James Cagney a member at any time?

MR. PARKS: Not to my knowledge. I don't recall ever attending a meeting with him.

MR. TAVENNER: Was he a member of the Communist Party, to your knowledge or from information made available to you?

MR. PARKS: I don't recall ever hearing that he was.

MR. TAVENNER: Sam Jaffe?

MR. PARKS: I don't recall ever attending a meeting with Sam Jaffe.

MR. TAVENNER: Was he a member of the Communist Party, to your knowledge or from information made available to you?

MR. PARKS: I don't recall any knowledge that Sam Jaffe was ever a member of the Communist Party.

MR. TAVENNER: John Garfield?

MR. PARKS: I don't recall ever being at a meeting with John Garfield.

MR. TAVENNER: Do you recall whether John Garfield ever addressed a Communist Party meeting when you were present?

MR. PARKS: I don't recall any such occasion.

MR. TAVENNER: Mark Lawrence, was he a member of that cell?

MR. PARKS: I believe he was. I wouldn't say with certainty. I believe so.

MR. TAVENNER: What is there in your memory that leads you to believe that he was a member of the Communist Party?

MR. PARKS: Well, as I told you, I didn't attend very many meetings, and I believe I recall that he was there. I don't swear to it.

MR. TAVENNER: Was it during the early part or the latter part of your membership that you have that recollection of him?

MR. PARKS: Well, this I couldn't say. I really don't

remember.

14

MR. MANDEL: May I suggest to counsel, in view of the general feeling of the witness -- I don't mean to rush you, but this whole thing being so distasteful, I wonder if we can proceed a little faster so he doesn't suffer so much while this is going on.

MR. TAVENNER: I want him to be accurate on it. I purposely do not want to rush him into answering about matters as important as these.

MR. MANDEL: I didn't infer that and mean that. I am just trying to be considerate of the man's feelings, doing something that --

MR. TAVENNER: I asked you this morning about Karen Morley. Was she a member of the Communist Party?

MR. PARKS: Yes, she was.

MR. TAVENNER: Was she in this particular cell that you have described?

MR. PARKS: Yes, she was.

MR. TAVENNER: Richard Collins, were you acquainted with him?

MR. PARKS: I know Richard Collins. He was not to my knowledge a member of the Communist Party.

(At this point Mr. Doyle left the hearing room.)

MR. TAVENNER: I have asked you whether or not members of the Communist Party from the eastern part of the United States had appeared before your Communist Party meetings. You

said you did not recall that any had.

MR. PARKS: That's correct.

MR. TAVENNER: But did Communist Party organizers from the state of California appear before your committee from time to time?

MR. PARKS: Not to the best of my recollection. I don't believe I ever met any of them or ever saw any of them.

MR. TAVENNER: Were lectures given at any time or study courses given in your cell in which persons outside of your cell took part?

MR. PARKS: Well, I believe on one occasion. The only one that I recall at this time was a talk by John Howard Lawson.

MR. TAVENNER: What was John Howard Lawson's connection with the Communist Party?

MR. PARKS: I don't really know. I don't really know.

MR. TAVENNER: Fred Graff, was he a member of this group?

MR. PARKS: What was the name?

MR. TAVENNER: G-r-a-f-f. Fred Graff, usually referred to as Freddie Graff.

MR. PARKS: The name doesn't ring a bell at all.

MR. TAVENNER: Georgia Backus?

MR. PARKS: No, I don't recall ever being at a meeting with Georgia Backus.

MR. TAVENNER: Meta Reis Rosenberg?

MR. PARKS: I don't believe I know the lady.

MR. TAVENNER: Robert Rossen?

MR. PARKS: No, I don't recall ever being at a meeting with him.

MR. TAVENNER: Do you know whether he was a member of your cell, even if you were not in a meeting with him?

MR. PARKS: No. To the best of my knowledge, I have no information at all.

MR. TAVENNER: Philip Loeb, L-o-e-b?

MR. PARKS: Who?

MR. TAVENNER: Philip Loeb, I believe is the correct pronunciation.

MR. PARKS: No, I don't recall I know the gentleman at all.

MR. TAVENNER: Lloyd Goff?

MR. PARKS: Yes, I believe he was a -- I saw him at a couple of meetings.

MR. TAVENNER: Sterling Hayden?

MR. PARKS: No, I don't recall ever being at a meeting with Sterling Hayden.

MR. TAVENNER: Will Geer?

MR. PARKS: No, I don't recall ever being in a meeting with Will Geer.

MR. TAVENNER: Victor Killian, Sr.?

MR. PARKS: Yes, I recall that he attended at least one meeting where I was present.

MR. TAVENNER: Victor Killian, Jr.?

MR. PARKS: I don't believe I am acquainted with the gentleman at all.

MR. TAVENNER: Lionel Stander?

MR. PARKS: I have met him. I don't recall ever attending a meeting with him.

MR. TAVENNER: Andy Devine?

MR. PARKS: I don't recall ever attending a meeting with Andy Devine.

MR. TAVENNER: Edward G. Robinson?

MR. PARKS: No, I don't recall ever attending a meeting with Edward G. Robinson.

MR. TAVENNER: Mr. Chairman, I think nearly all of these people have either been subpoenaed or we have tried to find them. Some of them unquestionably are attempting to avoid service.

Do you know Hester Sondergaard?

MR. PARKS: No, I don't recall ever meeting her. I believe that is Gale Sondergaard's sister.

MR. TAVENNER: Do you know whether she is married?

MR. PARKS: No, I don't.

MR. TAVENNER: Francis Edwards Farego?

MR. PARKS: No, I don't recall ever seeing her at a meeting.

MR. TAVENNER: Vera Caspary?

MR. PARKS: No, I don't believe that I know the woman.

MR. TAVENNER: Madelaine Carroll?

MR. PARKS: No, I don't recall ever attending a meeting with Madelaine Carroll.

MR. TAVENNER: Was she a member of this group, to your knowledge?

MR. PARKS: I have no knowledge of that.

MR. TAVENNER: Gregory Peck?

MR. PARKS: I have no remembrance of ever attending a meeting with Gregory Peck.

MR. TAVENNER: Humphrey Bogart?

MR. PARKS: I don't recall ever attending a meeting with Humphrey Bogart.

(At this point Mr. Jackson left the hearing room.)

MR. WALTER: I think you could get some comfort out of the fact that the people whose names have been mentioned have been subpoenaed, so that if they ever do appear here it won't be as a result of anything that you have testified to.

(At this point Mr. Kearney left the hearing room.)

MR. PARKS: It is no comfort whatsoever.

MR. TAVENNER: Do you know of any other person now whose name comes to your recollection?

MR. PARKS: No, I don't recall anyone else.

MR. TAVENNER: I think that is all, Mr. Chairman.

MR. POTTER: I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, that

Mr. Parks' testimony has certainly been refreshing in comparison with the other witnesses that we have had today.

MR. WOOD: I am sure you reflect the sentiments of the entire committee. We appreciate your cooperation, and subject to call the committee will stand in recess. You are excused. You do not have to remain here.

MR. MANDEL: We can go home now? He can go back to California?

MR. WOOD: Any time you like.

(Whereupon, at 4:40 p.m., the hearing was recessed, subject to call.)

** ** *

HEARINGS
BEFORE THE
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

Date March 21, 1951

ALTHEA ARCENEUX
520 MILLS BUILDING
WASHINGTON 6, D. C.
OFFICIAL REPORTER
TELEPHONE: WISCONSIN 5024

I N D E X

PUBLIC HEARING

March 21, 1951

- - -

Witnesses

	<u>Page</u>
Larry Parks	4
Howard Da Silva	87
Edith Holm Sondergaard (Gale Sondergaard)	107

McL

Wednesday, March 21, 1961

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
Washington, D. C.

PUBLIC HEARING

The Committee on Un-American Activities met pursuant to call at 10:35 a.m. in room 226, Old House Office Building, Hon. John S. Wood (chairman) presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives John S. Wood (chairman), Francis E. Walter, Clyde Doyle, James B. Frazier, Jr. (appearance as noted in transcript), Harold H. Velde, Bernard W. Kearney, Donald L. Jackson, and Charles E. Potter.

Staff members present: Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., counsel; Thomas W. Beale, Jr., assistant counsel; Louis J. Russell, senior investigator; William H. Wheeler, investigator; John W. Carrington, clerk; and A. S. Poore, editor.

- - -

Mr. WOOD. Let the record disclose that there are present Messrs. Walter, Doyle, Velde, Kearney, Jackson, Potter, and Wood, constituting a quorum.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, may I make a brief statement regarding the general purpose of the hearing?

Mr. WOOD. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. As is well known, the Committee on Un-American Activities has succeeded to a marked degree in

exposing Communists' infiltration into labor organizations with the result in many instances that the organizations involved have rid themselves of Communist domination and influences, and likewise with the result that the Congress has been informed of many important facts as the basis for legislative action.

I need only remind you that the testimony of Matthew Cvetie virtually destroyed for the time being at least the power and influence of the Communist Party in Western Pennsylvania.

Then there have been many witnesses who have frankly and openly told this Committee of the circumstances under which they were duped into joining the Communist Party, the Communist Party activities observed by them while they were members, and the reasons for their breaking with the party. This has required courage on the part of these witnesses. But in so testifying they have performed a service of inestimable value to their country and in the end should and do receive the plaudits of their fellow citizens.

The hearing today is the first of a series designed by the Committee to accomplish the same results in the entertainment field as have been accomplished in labor and other fields. In performing its statutory duty to investigate communism wherever it may be found, we shall endeavor to ascertain the extent of past and present Communist infil-

tration in the field mentioned.

It is hoped that any witness appearing during the course of these hearings, who made the mistake of associating himself or herself with the Communist Party, will have sufficient courage and loyalty to make an honest and complete disclosure of all they know about Communist Party activities.

These hearings, Mr. Chairman, have not been hastily conceived. They are based upon investigative efforts by staff members extending over a number of years. As you will recall, it was contemplated that these hearings be conducted in Hollywood by the subcommittee which was chosen to conduct the hearings in Hawaii, but in view of the work required of the staff in the preparation of the Hawaiian hearings and other hearings, this matter was postponed.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to call as the first witness Mr. Larry Parks.

MR. WOOD: Is Mr. Parks present?

MR. PARKS: Yes.

MR. WOOD: Will you stand, please? Do you solemnly swear the evidence you give this Committee shall be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

MR. PARKS: I do.

MR. WOOD: Have a seat.

SWORN TESTIMONY OF LARRY PARKS

MR. TAVENNER: Will you please state your full name, Mr. Parks?

MR. PARKS: Larry Parks.

MR. TAVENNER: Are you represented by counsel?

MR. PARKS: Yes, I am. My counsel is Mr. Mandel.

MR. TAVENNER: Will counsel identify himself?

MR. MANDEL: Louis Mandel, 1501 Broadway, New York City.

In the light of the testimony that Mr. Parks will give here, he has prepared a statement that he would like to read at this point. I think it is a proper background to the testimony he will give and be very enlightening to the Committee as his testimony unfolds. May he read that statement?

MR. WOOD: Is it your purpose, Mr. Tavenner, to ask the witness questions?

MR. TAVENNER: Yes, sir.

MR. WOOD: At the conclusion of his testimony, if he desires to read the statement that has been presented to the members here, he will be given that privilege, or he can put it in the record, as he desires, after he has finished his testimony.

MR. MANDEL: The only reason I asked for it at this point is because I think in light of the testimony it won't have the same effect after as it will when you connect it

with the testimony. And I think there is no harm. There is nothing in the statement that can't be connected with the testimony. There is nothing there except the simple statement of facts. And I would, in fairness to the witness, urge very strongly that he be permitted, because there is a connecting link to what he will testify here in this statement, because it is with that spirit that he will testify.

And I think, in proper consideration of the witness and what he will do, this opportunity ought to be given to him, and I urge it very strongly if the Committee will consider it.

MR. WOOD: Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

MR. TAVENNER: Mr. Parks, when and where were you born?

MR. PARKS: I was born on a farm in Kansas. I suppose the legal town would be Olathe. That was the closest town.

MR. TAVENNER: Will you relate briefly to the Committee the details regarding your educational background?

MR. PARKS: Well, I was born in Kansas on a farm. I moved when I was quite small to Illinois. I attended the high school in Joliet, Illinois, and I also attended and graduated from the University of Illinois where I majored in chemistry and minored in physics. I sometimes wonder how I got in my present line of work.

MR. TAVENNER: What was the date of the completion of your work at the University?

MR. PARKS: 1936.

MR. TAVENNER: Now, what is your present occupation?

MR. PARKS: Actor,

MR. TAVENNER: What is your present address?

MR. PARKS: 1737 Nichols Canyon, Hollywood, California.

MR. TAVENNER: Mr. Parks, I believe you were present when I made a statement as to the purpose of this series of hearings.

MR. PARKS: Yes, I was present and I heard you.

MR. TAVENNER: Then you understand that we desire to learn the true extent, past and present, of Communists' infiltration into the theater field in Hollywood, and the Committee asks your cooperation in developing such information. There has been considerable testimony taken before this Committee regarding a number of organizations in Hollywood, such as the Actors Laboratory, Actors Laboratory Theater, Associated Film Audiences Hollywood Branch, Citizens Committee for Motion Picture Strikers, Film Audiences for Democracy or Associated Film Audiences, Hollywood Anti-Nazi League or Hollywood League against Nazism, Hollywood Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions, Hollywood League for Democratic Action, Hollywood Motion Picture Democratic Committee, Hollywood Peace Forum, Hollywood Theater Alliance, Hollywood Writers Mobilization, Motion Picture Artists Committee, People's Educational Center, Los Angeles, Mooney Defense Committee, Hollywood Unit,

Progressive Citizens of America, Hollywood Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions, Council of the PCA, Southern California Chapter of the PCA, Workers School of Los Angeles.

Have you been connected or affiliated in any way with any of those organizations?

MR. PARKS: I have.

MR. TAVENNER: Will you state the names of those organizations which you have affiliated with? To aid you, I will hand you the list from which I read, some of which I may not have read, most of which I did.

MR. PARKS: Well, most of them I'm not familiar with. I'm familiar with the Actors Laboratory. It has it divided into two categories here. I'm familiar with the Actors Lab. I believe these two should be just one.

MR. TAVENNER: Well, did you hold any official position in that organization?

MR. PARKS: For a time I was sort of honorary treasurer of this organization.

MR. TAVENNER: Was that in 1949 and 1950 or when was that?

MR. PARKS: Well, I can't recall the exact date. I don't believe it was in 1950. I believe it was before that. I can't tell you the exact date.

MR. TAVENNER: Will you proceed?

MR. PARKS: Perhaps you could help me on this. The

Hollywood Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions, does this or did this have any other name attached to it before or after?

MR. TAVENNER: Just a moment. We are looking it up in our reference books.

There has been a finding that this organization grew out of the Independent Voters Committee of the Arts and Sciences. Does that help you?

MR. PARKS: Well, no. This is my problem: Most of these things I'm not familiar with. Some of them I recognize the names. And I believe that I for a time was a member of the Hollywood Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions.

MR. TAVENNER: Will you state again what it was that you were a member of?

MR. PARKS: I say I am of the opinion -- perhaps you could help me on this -- that I was a member of the Hollywood Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions.

MR. WOOD: We will have to ask the photographers to not block the view.

MR. PARKS: Perhaps if you would like to ask me any questions about it, I'd be happy to answer you. I think maybe it would expedite matters if you would do that.

MR. TAVENNER: Well, do you recall whether or not

the Progressive Citizens of America was the outgrowth or successor to the Hollywood Democratic Committee or what was known as the Hollywood Democratic Committee? Does that assist you?

MR. PARKS: I am of that opinion. I am of that opinion. I believe that's true. I think that was why I asked you the question in the first place. I didn't remember the name. I think that's true.

MR. TAVENNER: Were you a member of it?

MR. PARKS: Yes, I was.

MR. TAVENNER: Did you hold any official position in the organization?

MR. PARKS: No, I don't believe so. Not that I recall.

MR. TAVENNER: What other organizations listed there were you affiliated with?

MR. PARKS: What do you mean "affiliated with"?

MR. TAVENNER: Well, in which you have become a member or that you were active in support of, either by way of membership or by way of aid and support, by contribution or by work.

MR. PARKS: Well, I don't --

MR. TAVENNER: And if you aided in any way by entertainment, that I think would constitute affiliation or connection with the organization.

MR. PARKS: Well, that's all. Those two are the only

ones that I can think of at the moment. Perhaps if you could refresh my memory I would appreciate it.

MR. TAVENNER: Well, were you affiliated with the Civil Rights Congress in any manner?

MR. PARKS: No, I don't believe so. I don't recall being affiliated with that at this time.

MR. TAVENNER: Well, did you appear at any meeting of that organization to your knowledge?

MR. PARKS: It's quite possible that I did.

MR. TAVENNER: According to the "Evening Star" of Washington, D. C., of the issue of November 3, 1947, you are reported to have been one of the speakers.

MR. PARKS: As I say, it's quite possible at that particular time.

MR. TAVENNER: At a reception given Gerhart Eisler. Do you recall that?

MR. PARKS: No, I don't recall ever being at a reception for Gerhart Eisler. To the best of my knowledge I never met the man. I have never seen him. When I was in Washington last time I attended many meetings and many receptions. I'm not familiar with the names of these. If you ask me if I was at this reception, it's quite possible that I was. What the name of it is I can't recall at this time, and I probably didn't know at that time.

MR. TAVENNER: Now, referring back to the Actors

Laboratory of which you were an officer, you were the treasurer I believe? Is that not true?

MR. PARKS: In name I was treasurer, yes.

MR. TAVENNER: What do you mean by stating that you were treasurer "in name"?

MR. PARKS: Well, this was more of an honorary position than an active one. Usually you think of a man that is treasurer having to do only with money. My job as the treasurer was to sign a batch of checks at a time, and that's the extent of my knowledge of the money matters of the Lab.

MR. TAVENNER: Will you tell the Committee whether or not in your experience in Hollywood and as a member of these organizations to which you have testified there were to your knowledge Communists in these various organizations which I have referred to, particularly those that you were a member of?

MR. PARKS: I think that I can say yes to that.

MR. TAVENNER: Well, who were these Communists?

MR. PARKS: There were people in the Actors Lab, for instance-- This, in my opinion, was not a Communist organization in any sense of the word. As in any organization, it has all colors of political philosophy. And there were in these I suppose-- I know nothing about who belonged other than myself to the Independent Citizens Committee of

the Arts, Sciences and Professions. This I won't say because I don't know. There were Communists attached to the Lab.

MR. TAVENNER: Well, were there Communists attached to these other organizations which you say you were a member of?

MR. PARKS: This I'm not familiar with. I don't know. I don't know who else was a member of them besides myself.

MR. TAVENNER: Your answer is because you do not recall who were members of those other organizations?

MR. PARKS: I think that that is the gist of my answer, yes.

MR. TAVENNER: But you do recall that at the Actors Laboratory there were members of the Communist Party?

MR. PARKS: That's true.

MR. TAVENNER: Did those Communist Party members endeavor to obtain control of the activities of the organization and of its various offices?

MR. PARKS: No, I would not say that this was true at all. The Lab was a school for acting and was also sort of a showcase for actors. I left the Lab because I disagreed with the purpose. I was in favor of forming a permanent repertory theater. It was felt by the majority of the Lab that they wanted it the way it was, as a school. I wasn't interested in the school. They wanted it as a showcase. I didn't want it as a showcase. I wanted a permanent repertory theater for a small group of professional actors, and it

was on this basis that I left the Actors Lab.

MR. TAVENNER: Well, what was your opportunity to know and to observe the fact that there were Communists in that organization?

MR. PARKS: I knew them as Communists.

MR. TAVENNER: Well, what had been your opportunity to know them as Communists?

MR. PARKS: May I answer this fully and in my own way?

MR. TAVENNER: I would like for you to.

MR. PARKS: All right.

MR. TAVENNER: I hope you will.

MR. PARKS: I am not a Communist. I would like to point out that in my opinion there is a great difference between -- and not a subtle difference -- between being a Communist, a member of the Communist Party, say in 1941, ten years ago, and being a Communist in 1951. To my mind this is a great difference and not a subtle one.

It is also, I feel, not a subtle difference to be a member of the Communist Party and being a Communist. I do not believe in my own mind that this is a subtle difference either.

I would furnish you with -- I guess you would call it an allegory as to what I mean so that you will see why I say it is not a subtle difference.

The President of this country is a Democrat. He is

the head of the Democratic Party. They have a platform, certain aims. There are many people who call themselves Democrats. There are certain Southern Democrats, for instance, that do not follow the aims and platform of the Democratic Party as we call it, yet they are called Democrats. Well, in effect, they in my opinion are Republicans really; at least, this is the way they work.

MR. TAVENNER: Well, now, that could be said and a similar analysis could be given of the Progressive Party or any other party, but let us --

MR. PARKS: Yes.

MR. TAVENNER: -- confine ourselves to the question of communism, --

MR. PARKS: Yes. Well, I'm drawing an allegory.

MR. TAVENNER: -- rather than speaking in terms of allegory.

MR. PARKS: Well, I felt that it was necessary so that you could see that this is not a subtle difference, you see.

MR. TAVENNER: No, I think the Committee can understand by speaking plainly --

MR. PARKS: Yes.

MR. TAVENNER: -- and to the point --

MR. PARKS: I'm trying to.

MR. TAVENNER: -- on communism.

MR. PARKS: I'm trying to. As I say, I am not a

Communist. I was a member of the Communist Party when I was a much younger man ten years ago. I was a member of the Communist Party.

MR. TAVENNER: I wish you would tell the Committee the circumstances under which you became a member of the Communist Party; that is, when and where and, if you left the Communist Party as you have indicated, when you did it and why you did it.

MR. PARKS: Well, I will do this if I may. I missed one point that I mentioned -- that there is also a difference I feel in being a member of the Communist Party in 1941 and being a Communist in 1951. In 1941-- All right?

MR. TAVENNER: Go ahead.

MR. PARKS: -- being a member of the Communist Party fulfilled certain needs of a young man that was liberal in thought, idealistic, who was for the underprivileged, the underdog. I felt that it fulfilled these particular needs. I think that being a Communist in 1951 in this particular situation is an entirely different kettle of fish when this is a great power that is trying to take over the world. This is the difference.

I became a Communist --

MR. TAVENNER: Now, just a moment. In other words, you didn't realize that the purpose and object of the Communist Party was to take over other segments of the world in 1941,

but you do realize that that is true in 1951? Is that the point you are making?

MR. PARKS: Well, I would like to say this: That this is in no way an apology for anything that I have done, you see, because I feel I have done nothing wrong ever. Question of judgment? This is debatable. I feel that as far as I am concerned that in 1941, as far as I knew it, the purposes as I knew them fulfilled simply -- at least I thought they would fulfill as I said before -- certain idealism, certain being for the underdog, which I am today this very minute.

This did not work out particularly this way. I wasn't particularly interested in it after I did become a member. I attended very few meetings, and I drifted away from it the same way that-- I petered out the same way I drifted into it. To the best of my recollection, as I recall -- the dates are not exact because at that particular time it wasn't an important step one way or the other; I feel as I say that the dates are approximate -- it was in 1941, and to the best of my recollection I petered out about the latter part of 1944 or 1945.

MR. TAVENNER: Now, we are not making here a distinction between the Communist Party and the Communist political association, but, as a result of investigation that the Committee has done and information that it has, you apparently were registered for the year 1944 and 1945 as a member of

the party. Is that in accordance with your recollection?

MR. PARKS: Well, as I say, I am trying to recall it for you to the best of my ability, and I must say again that at that particular time it was not quite as important as it is today, and to the best of my recollection I became a member in 1941, and to the best of my recollection it was either in the latter part of 1944 or the early part of 1945 --

MR. TAVENNER: Let me see if this information in the Committee files would be of any value in refreshing your recollection: That your Communist registration card for the year 1944 bore the number 46954 and for the year 1945 the number 47344. Does that happen to refresh your recollection?

MR. PARKS: No, sir, it doesn't, because to the best of my recollection I never had a Communist Party card.

MR. TAVENNER: Now, do I infer properly from your statement that shortly after 1945 or say in 1946 you became disillusioned about the Communist Party and withdrew as a member?

MR. PARKS: Well, let's go back. As I said before, to the best of my recollection it was in 1944 or 1945. This is to the best of my recollection.

MR. TAVENNER: But by 1946 at least you had definitely broken with the party?

MR. PARKS: I'm quite sure that that is correct.

MR. TAVENNER: Have you participated in any Communist

Party activities since that date, 1946?

MR. PARKS: Not to my knowledge. I don't recall ever having participated in a Communist Party activity since that time.

MR. TAVENNER: Now, will you state to the Committee where you first became a member of the party?

MR. PARKS: In Hollywood, California.

MR. TAVENNER: Who recruited you into the party?

MR. PARKS: Well, a man by the name of Davidson I believe.

MR. TAVENNER: What was Davidson's first name and what was his position?

MR. PARKS: I can't tell you this because I really don't know. I don't remember his first name. I haven't seen him for ten years, and I do not know what his position was.

MR. TAVENNER: Where did he live? Do you know?

MR. PARKS: This I have no idea.

MR. TAVENNER: What was his occupation?

MR. PARKS: This I do not know either.

MR. TAVENNER: Can you give us some descriptive data of the individual?

MR. PARKS: Average-looking man, young, dark hair.

MR. TAVENNER: How did you become acquainted with him and in whose presence did you see him?

MR. PARKS: It's pretty hard for me to recall ten years ago something that at the time was not particularly

important. I'm doing the best I can to recall what happened for you. I don't remember his first name, and I don't believe I ever knew what he did.

MR. TAVENNER: Well, what were the circumstances under which you met?

MR. PARKS: Well, this is hard for me to recall too, the exact circumstances.

MR. TAVENNER: Was it at a meeting in your home or where?

MR. PARKS: Well, as I say, I really don't remember. I'm being as honest as I know how. I really don't remember.

MR. TAVENNER: I just wanted you to give the Committee what information you recall about --

MR. PARKS: Yes.

MR. TAVENNER: -- about how you got into the Communist Party.

MR. PARKS: As I told you, I was a good deal younger than I am now, about 25, with certain liberal tendencies, idealism.

MR. TAVENNER: Well, did you seek this individual out, or did he seek you out?

MR. PARKS: Well, I certainly didn't seek him out. It's hard for me to say whether he sought me out.

MR. TAVENNER: Did others counsel you in regard to your uniting with the Communist Party before you were

recruited by this individual by the name of Davidson?

MR. PARKS: No. I did it of my own volition.

MR. TAVENNER: Were you assigned to a Communist Party cell?

MR. PARKS: I was.

MR. TAVENNER: What was the name of that cell, and where was it located?

MR. PARKS: Well, it had no name that I know of. It was a group of people who were Communists, and I attended some meetings with them.

MR. TAVENNER: Well, now, you were a member of that particular group from 1941 up to possibly as late as 1945?

MR. PARKS: That's correct.

MR. TAVENNER: Will you tell us what you know about the organization of the Communist Party from your own observations during that period of time in Hollywood?

MR. PARKS: Well, I'm afraid that I was a pretty bad member by their lights. I didn't attend too many meetings -- maybe ten, twelve, fifteen meetings. And what I really know about the Communist Party is very little really. If you will ask me some questions that you would like to know, I would be happy to answer them to the best of my ability.

MR. TAVENNER: Do you know whether or not the writers and actors in Hollywood were members of any particular branch or group of the Communist Party?

MR. PARKS: I know that certain actors were a group that met. This I do know. The other things I do not know.

MR. WOOD: Let the record show that at this point Representative Frazier has joined the hearing.

MR. TAVENNER: What was the name of the group to which the actors were assigned?

MR. PARKS: They had no name that I know of.

MR. TAVENNER: Did it have any designation of any kind?

MR. PARKS: Not that I know of.

MR. TAVENNER: By location or by the type of work they were in?

MR. PARKS: Well, no name that I know of. The majority of the members of this particular group were actors.

MR. TAVENNER: Well, were there several groups to which the actors belonged depending upon the geographical location of the actor?

MR. PARKS: I don't believe so. I wouldn't say for certain. I'm not under that impression.

MR. TAVENNER: Well, who was the chairman of the group to which you were assigned?

MR. PARKS: Well, it had no chairman that I know of, that I recall, anyone that was chairman.

MR. TAVENNER: Well, who was the secretary of the group?

MR. PARKS: This --

MR. TAVENNER: Or treasurer?

MR. PARKS: This I do not recall either. I don't know if there were any actual officers of this particular group.

MR. TAVENNER: Well, to whom did you pay your dues?

MR. PARKS: To various members. No one in particular that I can recall was the treasurer.

MR. TAVENNER: Well, a person who was responsible for the collection of dues would certainly be performing the duty of a treasurer even if he did not go by that name? Isn't that true?

MR. PARKS: That's very true.

MR. TAVENNER: Well, who were those persons to whom you paid your dues?

MR. PARKS: Well, this is hard for me to answer too, because the few times that I paid dues as I recall were to different people. Just who they were I just can't answer this.

MR. TAVENNER: You cannot recall the name of any one individual to whom you paid?

MR. PARKS: No one individual can I recall that I paid the dues to.

MR. TAVENNER: Well, was Communist Party literature distributed to the members at any of the meetings or through any medium?

MR. PARKS: Certain pamphlets were available if you wished to buy them.

MR. TAVENNER: Who was the individual who had charge of the distribution or sale of those pamphlets?

MR. PARKS: This I don't know either, because the pamphlets were there and you could buy them if you wished.

MR. TAVENNER: Well, was there any secret about who was handling the literature of the party?

MR. PARKS: No secret at all.

MR. TAVENNER: What was the total membership of this cell in which you were a member?

MR. PARKS: Well, it's hard for me to tell you the total membership, because, as I say, I attended meetings irregularly and not many of them. I would say that it ranged from certain meetings that there were as little as five, and I think it went up to maybe, oh, possibly ten or twelve.

MR. TAVENNER: And did the personnel change considerably between 1941 and 1945, or did it consist of the same members during all that period of time?

MR. PARKS: Well, I do know that, as I say, I attended rather irregularly, and at some of the meetings I would see someone that I didn't know, I didn't recognize, and I would never see them again. So if this-- This is the best answer I can give you to your question. There were people who I did not know. I did not know their names. I did not recognize them. And I did not see them again at any meeting.

MR. TAVENNER: Did speakers or organizers, Communist

Party organizers, appear before your group from time to time, people from the East, let us say?

MR. PARKS: No, I don't recall ever seeing anyone from the East, as you say, or any "big shot," if you will allow me to put it that way. I don't recall ever seeing any of those at any of these meetings.

MR. TAVENNER: Well, are you acquainted with V. J. Jerome?

MR. PARKS: No, I'm not; to the best of my knowledge, I have never met the man.

MR. TAVENNER: Have you ever seen him in Hollywood?

MR. PARKS: I don't believe I have ever seen him. I certainly know I would not recognize the man if he walked into the room.

MR. TAVENNER: Are you acquainted with Lionel Stander?

MR. PARKS: I have met him.

MR. TAVENNER: Have you ever attended a Communist Party meeting with him?

MR. PARKS: I don't recall ever attending a Communist Party meeting with this Lionel Stander.

MR. TAVENNER: Do you know whether or not or do you have personal knowledge of whether or not he is a Communist Party member, or do you have knowledge made available to you through Communist Party sources of his membership in the Communist Party?

MR. PARKS: No, I do not have this knowledge at all.

MR. TAVENNER: Are you acquainted with Karen Morley?

MR. PARKS: I am.

MR. TAVENNER: Is she a member of the Communist Party?

MR. PARKS: Well, Counsel, these-- I would prefer not to mention names if it is at all possible of anyone. I don't think it is fair to people to do this. I have come to you at your request. I have come and willingly tell you about myself. I think that if you would allow me I would prefer not to be questioned about names. And I will tell you everything that I know about myself, because I feel I have done nothing wrong, and I will answer any question that you would like to put to me about myself. I would prefer, if you will allow me, not to mention other people's names.

MR. WALTER: Do you take the same position with respect to the obvious leaders of the Communist movement?

MR. PARKS: I do, because I don't know any of the leaders of the Communist movement.

MR. WALTER: Of course, you do know who was active in the movement in California?

MR. PARKS: No, I only know the names of people who attended certain meetings that I attended, and these were not people who were -- I know were not people who were active, big leaders of the Communist Party. These people I did not know, and I have never met them.

MR. WALTER: Who directed the meetings that you attended?

MR. PARKS: The meetings consisted mainly, if you will remember the time, consisted mainly of discussions of -- we were in a war then -- discussions of how the war was going, current events, problems of actors in their work. It was more of a social, really a social occasion than a stereotyped kind of meeting. Does that answer your question, Congressman?

MR. WALTER: It's an answer.

MR. PARKS: Hmm?

MR. WALTER: It's an answer.

MR. PARKS: Well, I would like to answer your question if you're not satisfied with that answer.

MR. WALTER: Somebody must have indicated a course of procedure. Somebody must have directed activity. Because you just didn't sit down in a polite discussion group without having an objective.

MR. PARKS: Well, --

MR. WALTER: No, what I am interested in knowing is who directed the activities that this group were engaged in.

MR. PARKS: And I repeat again that no one to my knowledge directed any kind of activities. You must believe me when I say that for all intents and purposes it was more of a social occasion than any kind of a usual meeting.

MR. POTTER: Who would call the meetings together?

MR. PARKS: Well, I don't really know. I can't really answer this.

MR. POTTER: Did you have a set, scheduled meeting once every month or once every week, or was it upon the call of some individual?

MR. PARKS: Well, as I recall, various individuals would call. I don't believe that there was any set --

MR. POTTER: Certainly it wasn't run by mental telepathy.

MR. PARKS: No. I didn't say that. I say certain individuals would call, and to the best of my knowledge there was no set schedule of meetings.

MR. POTTER: Somebody had to issue a call?

MR. PARKS: That's correct.

MR. POTTER: Did you ever issue a call for your cell to get together?

MR. PARKS: Did I?

MR. POTTER: Yes.

MR. PARKS: No, I didn't.

MR. POTTER: Then, somebody would have to tell you when the meetings would take place and where they would take place? Is that not true?

MR. PARKS: That's correct. I would get a call from a member of the group and they would say, "Well, let's have a meeting tonight, tomorrow night."

MR. KEARNEY: Were the meetings always held at the same place?

MR. PARKS: No, they were not.

MR. KEARNEY: Were they held in halls or in your own homes?

MR. PARKS: These were held at homes. As I say, --

MR. KEARNEY: Did you ever have any meeting at your own home?

MR. PARKS: Never.

MR. KEARNEY: Where were some of the meetings held?

MR. PARKS: If I might add as a word of explanation, that these were people like myself, small type people, no different than myself in any respect at all, and no different than you or I.

MR. KEARNEY: Where were some of these meetings held?

MR. PARKS: As I say, these were held in various homes in Hollywood.

MR. KEARNEY: Can you name some of them?

MR. PARKS: Well, as I asked the counsel and as I asked the Committee, if you will allow this, I would prefer not to mention names under these circumstances: That these were people like myself who-- And I feel that I have done nothing wrong ever. I mean along this line. I am sure none of us is perfect. Again, the question of judgment certainly is there, and even that is debatable. But these are people --

MR. WOOD: Just a moment. At that point, do you entertain the feeling that these other parties are likewise guiltless of any wrong that you were associated with?

MR. PARKS: The people at that time as I knew them-- This is my opinion of them. This is my honest opinion: that these are people who did nothing wrong, people like myself.

MR. WOOD: Mr. Parks, in what way do you feel it would be injurious then to them to divulge their identities, when you expressed the opinion that at no time did they do wrong?

MR. PARKS: This brings up many questions on a personal basis, Mr. Congressman, as an actor. If you think it's easy for a man who has-- I think I have worked hard in my profession, climbed up the ladder a bit. If you think it's easy for me to appear before this Committee and testify, you're mistaken, because it's not easy. This is a very difficult and arduous job for me for many reasons.

One of the reasons is that as an actor my activity is dependent a great deal on the public. To be called before this Committee at your request has a certain inference, a certain innuendo that you are not loyal to this country. This is not true. I am speaking for myself. This is not true. But the inference and the innuendo is there as far as the public is concerned.

Also as a representative of a great industry -- not as an official representative; I don't mean it that way -- but

as an actor of the motion picture industry that is fairly well known, in that respect I am a representative of the industry. This is a great industry. At this particular time it is being investigated for Communist influence.

MR. WOOD: Don't you think the public is entitled to know about it?

MR. PARKS: Hmm?

MR. WOOD: Don't you feel the public is entitled to know about it?

MR. PARKS: I certainly do, and I am opening myself wide open to you to any question that you can ask me. I will answer as honestly as I know how. And at this particular time, as I say, the industry is-- It's like taking a pot shot at a wounded animal, because the industry is not in as good a shape today as it has been, economically I'm speaking. It has been pretty tough on it. And, as I say, this is a great industry, and I don't say this only because it has been kind to me. It has a very important job to do to entertain people, in certain respects to call attention to certain evils, but mainly to entertain, and in this I feel that they have done a great job. Always when our country has needed certain help, the industry has been in the forefront of that help.

MR. TAVENNER: Mr. Chairman, may I make an observation?

MR. WOOD: Yes.

MR. TAVENNER: You are placing your reluctance to

testify upon the great job that the moving picture industry is doing or can do?

MR. PARKS: Excuse me, Mr. Counsel. I really hadn't finished, and that was just part of it. If you'd let me finish, then-- Is that all right?

MR. TAVENNER: Very well.

MR. PARKS: That's one part of it. On the question of naming names, it is my honest opinion that the few people that I could name, these names would not be of service to the Committee at all. I am sure that you know who they are. These people I feel honestly are like myself, and I feel that I have done nothing wrong. Question of judgment? Yes, perhaps. And I also feel that this is not-- To be asked to name names like this is not in the way of American justice as we know it, that we as Americans have all been brought up, that this is a bad thing to force a man to do this. I have been brought up that way. I am sure all of you have.

And it seems to me that this is not the American way of doing things -- to force a man who is under oath and who has opened himself as wide as possible to this Committee -- and it hasn't been easy to do this -- to force a man to do this is not American justice.

I perhaps later can think of more things to say when I leave, but this is in substance I guess what I want to say.

MR. WOOD: Well, I am glad, of course, to give

considerable leeway to the range of your statement, because I for one am rather curious to understand just what the reasons are in your mind for declining to answer the question.

MR. PARKS: I'm not declining. I'm asking you if you would not press me on this.

MR. WOOD: I'm not going to press the point with you, unless other members of the Committee wish to.

MR. POTTER: Mr. Chairman, could I ask one question?

MR. WOOD: Mr. Potter.

MR. POTTER: Are any of the members that were in the particular Communist cell that you were in to your knowledge still active members in the Communist Party?

MR. PARKS: I can't say this, Congressman, because I have divorced myself completely. I have no way of knowing this at all. I know what I think inside if that would-- My opinion is that 99 per cent of them are not. This is my opinion, that they are people like myself.

MR. POTTER: If you knew people in Hollywood that were identified with the party then, would you be reluctant to cite their names if they were active members at the present time?

MR. PARKS: I would be reluctant on only one score: that I do not think that it is good for an American to be forced to do this. Only on this score. But I feel that a man -- the people that I knew-- It is my opinion that they

are not members of the Communist Party at this time. This is my opinion only. If they are, they shouldn't be.

MR. POTTER: If you had knowledge of a man who committed murder, certainly you wouldn't be hesitant to give that information to the proper authorities?

MR. PARKS: That is correct.

MR. POTTER: Now, I assume that you share the belief that we share that an active member of the Communist Party believes in principles that we don't believe in, in overthrowing our government by force and violence. Now, you say you would readily give information concerning a man you have knowledge has committed murder. Wouldn't you also give information to the proper authorities of a man you knew or a woman you knew or believed to be working to overthrow our government by force and violence?

MR. PARKS: I will say this to you. If I knew a man that committed murder, this is against the law of our land. And I'm not drawing a fine line for my own protection when I say this. I'm not doing this at all. I'm telling you honestly what I think. This is against the law of our land. This is a reprehensible thing to do to commit murder, and I certainly would name him immediately. The other question is -- even now it is not against the law of our land, the legal law of the land. Do you understand the difference that I mean?

MR. POTTER: So when we are drafting men to fight Communist aggression, you feel that it is not your duty as an American citizen to give the Committee the benefit of what knowledge you might have concerning persons who are in the very opposite?

MR. PARKS: Who are what?

MR. POTTER: Who are in the very opposite as to what our men are fighting for?

MR. PARKS: Well, yes, I wanted to do that. I think that there is a difference, Congressman, in my opinion. There is a difference between people who would harm our country and people who in my opinion are like myself, who, as I feel, did nothing wrong at the time, --

MR. POTTER: You don't believe a man today --

MR. PARKS: -- and is guilty of bad judgment.

MR. POTTER: Yes, I'm not questioning that point when you say that people like yourself and others may be misguided or because of faulty judgment were members of the party. But you don't believe today that anyone can be naive enough to belong to the Communist Party, be an active member of the Communist Party, and not know what he's doing?

MR. PARKS: That is correct. That is correct. That is what I believe.

MR. POTTER: For that reason I can't see your consistency in saying why you won't name someone who you know today is

an active member of the party.

MR. PARKS: But I do not know anyone today that is an active member of the party. This is what I said at the outset of this, Congressman.

MR. POTTER: If you did know, you would tell?

MR. PARKS: Yes, I think I would.

MR. POTTER: That's all.

MR. TAVENNER: Mr. Parks, it seems to me that your argument in substance is this: That this Committee should investigate communism but not find out who it is that is a Communist.

MR. PARKS: No, Counsel, that is not my --

MR. TAVENNER: In the final analysis, isn't that your argument?

MR. PARKS: No, this is not my argument at all. Not at all.

MR. TAVENNER: You are taking the position that in your opinion it is not important to find out who may be in communism in Hollywood --

MR. PARKS: No, --

MR. TAVENNER: -- rather than for this Committee to determine what its obligations are under the statute which created it to investigate communism?

MR. PARKS: No, counsel, I didn't say this at all.

MR. TAVENNER: But isn't that the result of your

argument?

MR. PARKS: No, Counsel, I do not believe that this is the result of my argument at all. What I say to you and what I believe is that the few people that I knew at that time are people like myself who are as loyal to this country as you or anybody else is.

MR. TAVENNER: And if every witness who came before this Committee were permitted to take that position, then the extent of the investigation that this Committee could conduct would be limited entirely by the attitude of the witness, wouldn't it?

MR. PARKS: But I told you the circumstances surrounding my small activity with the Communist Party, you see. And this makes quite a difference. This makes quite a difference.

MR. TAVENNER: In your judgment?

MR. PARKS: In my judgment, yes. Not only in my judgment. I know -- at least inside of myself -- that these people were like myself, and the most that you can accuse them of is a lack of judgment. And even this --

MR. TAVENNER: Now, you --

MR. PARKS: Even this I will say again: I say none of this in apology for what I did, because a young man at 25, if he's not a liberal, if he is not full of idealism, is not worth his salt. And if you make a mistake in judgment like this, I don't particularly myself believe that it is

serious. If you arrive at certain conclusions after this --

MR. TAVENNER: Yes, but if every witness who took the stand before this Committee would be the final judge of when a thing was serious and when it was not, and the Committee would be limited accordingly, how could this Committee carry out its statutory duty?

MR. PARKS: But I'm asking you as a man, having told you and opened myself to you, that --

MR. TAVENNER: And I'm only asking that you see the other side of it.

MR. PARKS: I do see the other side.

MR. TAVENNER: Now, you have placed Hollywood on a very high pedestal here.

MR. PARKS: I have.

MR. TAVENNER: But there has been testimony here involving the scientific professions, persons in government, persons in numerous industries, and I take it that there is no distinction or no preference of any kind that should be allowed to your profession over that of the scientific professions or any other calling in life.

MR. PARKS: That is true. But I have told you and, as I say, opened myself as wide as I know how to you and told you the extent of my activities as a member at one time of the Communist Party as a young man. What little I know, as you can judge for yourself-- As I told you, and it's the

truth, I was probably the poorest member of the Communist Party that has existed. And the few people that I knew, you probably know their names. I can see no way that this would be of additional help to this Committee. And, Counsel, I am sure that you realize that if this was really consequential, I would do it. But you must realize the position.

MR. TAVENNER: Pardon me.

MR. PARKS: I say you must realize that, as inconsequential as I was in it, the few people that I knew, that it is very distasteful to me to be forced into that position.

MR. TAVENNER: I recognize that. There certainly can be no difference in opinion about that. It is a distasteful position to be in.

MR. PARKS: And I --

MR. TAVENNER: And you have avowed here that because of the difference in the situation with regard to the party now from what it was in 1941 you have withdrawn because you now understand the purposes of this organization which you joined years ago. Now, if you would be equally frank with regard to other people who are connected with this organization, then this Committee would be permitted to function in line with its organization, with the statutory duty that rests upon it.

And, therefore, I am going to ask you who it was who acted as secretary of this group. You expressed some doubt

about it a while ago. But do you now know who was the secretary?

MR. PARKS: And I can honestly say to you that I do not know, to the best of my remembrance, and I am as honest as I know how. I do not know.

MR. TAVENNER: Do you know Elizabeth Leech?

MR. PARKS: I do not believe I know Elizabeth Leech. I don't recall ever meeting an Elizabeth Leech.

MR. TAVENNER: Do you know a person by the name of Elizabeth Glenn?

MR. PARKS: No, to the best of my knowledge I do not know any person by that name.

MR. TAVENNER: Do you know a person by the name of Marjorie Potts?

MR. PARKS: To the best of my knowledge I do not know anyone by the name of Marjorie Potts. I don't recall ever meeting these people.

MR. TAVENNER: Now, do you know Karen Morley?

MR. PARKS: I do.

MR. TAVENNER: Was Karen Morley a member of this group with you?

MR. PARKS: And I ask you again, Counsel, to reconsider forcing me to name names under the circumstances, when I told you that I was a member only for a short time and at that particular time in my opinion the people I knew were

like myself. And I ask you again to reconsider and not to force me into this position. I don't think that under the circumstances this is really American justice to force me to do this under these circumstances, when I have come to you 3,000 miles and opened myself as I have.

MR. WALTER: Mr. Chairman, may I ask counsel a question? How can it be material to the purpose of this inquiry to have the names of people when we already know them? Aren't we actually, by insisting that this man testify as to names, overlooking the fact that we want to know what the organization did, what it hoped to accomplish, how it actually had or attempted to influence the thinking of the American people through the arts? So why is it so essential that we know the names of all of the people when we have a witness who may make a contribution to what we are trying to learn?

MR. PARKS: May I answer your question?

MR. WALTER: No, I am directing my question to counsel.

MR. PARKS: I'm sorry.

MR. TAVENNER: My answer to that, Mr. Walter, is that although there is information relating to some of these individuals as to whom I had expected to interrogate this witness, some of them have evaded service of process, so that we cannot bring them here. That is one point.

Another is that this Committee ought to be entitled to receive proof of information which it has in its files as a

result of its previous investigations relating to a matter of this kind. There would be no way to really investigate Communist infiltration into labor without asking who are Communists in labor. And the same thing is true here in Hollywood.

Those are the reasons I think it is material.

MR. WALTER: But isn't it far more important to learn the extent of the activity and what the purpose of the organization actually was than to get a long list of names of bleeding hearts and fools, suckers, hard-boiled Communist politicians. I don't know as it makes too much difference. As long as we have a witness willing and anxious to cooperate in carrying out what I conceive to be our purpose, I think the rest is all immaterial.

MR. TAVENNER: As to the other information --

MR. VELDE: Will the gentleman yield?

MR. TAVENNER: May I make one statement?

MR. VELDE: Yes.

MR. TAVENNER: As to the other information, as to the purposes and objects of the various organizations, that was the subject of the testimony of about 20 witnesses or more here. I have referred to those organizations, as organizations as to which there has been considerable evidence before your Committee.

MR. WALTER: May I ask this witness a question, Mr.

Chairman, at this point?

MR. WOOD: Yes. Mr. Walter.

MR. WALTER: Were you instructed to attempt to influence the thinking of the American people through various exhibitions on the stage or on the screen? Was that the purpose of your organization?

MR. PARKS: I was never instructed at any time to do this, and I think that if you are a follower of the motion picture industry -- that is, if you go to movies is what I mean -- if you are familiar with it, I think that it is almost evident that this was not done in pictures.

MR. WALTER: Well, was it talked about? Was it the purpose of the Communist organization to attempt to set up a hard core in Hollywood that would slant pictures and performances so as to influence the thinking of the American people?

MR. PARKS: Not to my knowledge, Mr. Congressman, at all. As I say, I was with a small group of actors. But as a person who is close to the industry, I think that this is almost an impossibility. If you are familiar -- you probably aren't -- with the making of pictures, first of all it's impossible I feel, as an actor, to do this as an actor. I was never asked to do it. It was never discussed. And I think it is impossible.

A script that is written is the important thing about

making a picture. You can only make a stinker if you have a poor script.

MR. WOOD: On that point, wouldn't it be true that the writer of that script is in a position to very decidedly slant --

MR. PARKS: No, sir, I don't believe this is true. I really and honestly don't believe that this is true. Because every studio-- You see, there are, I think, on the average of about 400 pictures made in Hollywood approximately. I don't know the exact number. I think it's something like that. This is divided up among a number of studios. A script passes through usually -- and unfortunately -- as an actor I think this -- through too many hands. My personal opinion is that a script should be written by one man and it should be directed by the same man. But this happens hardly ever to my knowledge. It passes through several writers usually. They think-- If one man is good for jokes, they put him in for jokes. And another man, if they want a tear-jerker, they will assign him to that particular portion of it.

It goes to an associate producer, a producer, the heads of the studios. And I think you are familiar with the men that are the heads of the studios in Hollywood. And it is my opinion, it is my personal opinion, my studied opinion, that this is an impossibility. And to bear me out --

MR. WOOD: And didn't happen?

MR. PARKS: I do not believe that this has ever happened.

MR. WOOD: Very well. Now --

MR. PARKS: In my opinion.

MR. WOOD: Now, you're leaving a very decided impression on my mind that in your thinking there was nothing, no attempt to influence the character of the pictures or other entertainment that emanated from the studios that your group was connected with, and that there was nothing off color about the action or the conduct of any of the people that belonged to it. Then, how could it possibly reflect against the members of this group for the names to be known, any more than it would if they belonged to the Young Men's Christian Association?

MR. PARKS: May I answer this, Congressman?

MR. WOOD: Yes. I'm asking you.

MR. PARKS: Yes. As a finish to what I said before, and I think to bear me out on what I said before, you may or may not like the picture that comes out, and I am not saying that each picture is an artistic or a commercial masterpiece. This is not true. Everyone knows this. But I think this is the proof of what I say: That you cannot find one picture that has been slanted adversely deliberately. This I do not believe.

Again, a man can make a mistake in judgment, Congressman.

A man can make a mistake in judgment.

Now, to answer your last question, I must-- I feel as I do about it because myself I am a good example I think. As I said before, it's not easy personally for me to be here. Anybody who thinks it is is out of their mind. Over and above that, it is doubtful whether, after appearing before this committee, whether my career will continue. It is extremely doubtful. For coming here and telling you the truth.

You see, there were other things open to me that I could have done. But, feeling that I have not done anything wrong, that I will tell you the truth. There were other things that were open to me that I could have done, and I chose not to do them.

MR. WALTER: Actually, the producers, particularly in recent years, have been very careful to examine scripts so that they would not be slanted. Is that not the fact?

MR. PARKS: I think that this is correct. I think this is correct.

MR. WOOD: I believe Mr. Doyle wanted to ask you a question. Mr. Doyle.

MR. DOYLE: Mr. Parks, have you any knowledge of the extent to which the movie industry, if it has, has made a conscientious effort to clean out any subversive influences in the industry either on the part of the actors or

otherwise? Are you conscious of any fixed determination since 1946?

MR. PARKS: Yes, there certainly-- I think that this is common knowledge.

MR. DOYLE: Well, is it part of your knowledge?

MR. PARKS: Yes, of course. When I say "common knowledge" I mean mine, yours, everybody's. I believe that everyone knows that there has been a conscious effort to be absolutely free of any kind of communism.

MR. DOYLE: May I ask this? A few minutes ago you said you were for a time honorary treasurer of one of these two groups that you stated you believed you were a member of. I think you said the extent of your duty as honorary treasurer was to sign a batch of checks all at the same time.

MR. PARKS: That's right.

MR. DOYLE: To whom were those checks written or for what purpose?

MR. PARKS: Well, these were written to pay the office help, the secretaries, the clean-up man, the teachers, electric company, the utility bills, bills for lumber and paint for scenery, et cetera.

MR. DOYLE: Now, I noticed just now you said these checks were paid for secretaries and office help. What secretaries? How many secretaries and what office help for what organization?

MR. PARKS: For the Actors Lab.

MR. DOYLE: How many secretaries did you have?

MR. PARKS: Well, it varied from none to one to at certain times when a show was being given and tickets were being mailed out to -- I don't really recall -- possibly three, four.

MR. DOYLE: Now, with reference to the cell which you said you attended some 12 or 15 times to the best of your recollection, --

MR. PARKS: Yes.

MR. DOYLE: -- was that attendance spread over from 1941 to 1945?

MR. PARKS: That's correct.

MR. DOYLE: Inclusive?

MR. PARKS: That's --

MR. DOYLE: I think you said your attendance averaged from five to 12 or 15.

MR. PARKS: Well, as I recall, it averaged from five, ten, 12, in that --

MR. DOYLE: Were the majority of those in attendance men or women?

MR. PARKS: I would say it was-- I had never thought about it. I suppose equally divided.

MR. DOYLE: Did you recognize at each meeting at which you were in attendance some actors and some actresses?

MR. PARKS: That's correct.

MR. DOYLE: About what proportion of the attendance, when 12 or 15 were in attendance, were members of the actors' or actresses' group?

MR. PARKS: Well, when I say 12, this as I recall-- I'm using this number. I don't recall the exact number. I think that probably was the largest meeting. And these were all in the acting profession.

MR. DOYLE: Then, am I to understand that the entire attendance was, as far as you knew, members of the actors' profession?

MR. PARKS: I believe that this is true.

MR. DOYLE: Was this one cell limited to members of the actors' profession?

MR. PARKS: To the best of my knowledge, I believe it was limited to that.

MR. DOYLE: It was limited?

MR. PARKS: I believe it was, yes.

MR. DOYLE: And I think you said you more or less had a social affair. Did you have refreshments?

MR. PARKS: Yes, we did. Coffee. Well, I'm serious when I say that. Coffee, doughnuts.

MR. DOYLE: Did the cell have dues?

MR. PARKS: It did.

MR. DOYLE: How much were the dues?

MR. PARKS: Well, again, it's difficult for me to say.
As I recall, I think --

MR. DOYLE: How much did you pay?

MR. PARKS: Well, during --

MR. DOYLE: And how often?

MR. PARKS: Well, during the course-- I must explain to you a little about myself: That I'm not, I don't think, a stingy man, but I'm known as a close man with a dollar, and I'm serious when I say this. And to the best of my knowledge, I think during the short time I was connected with this organization that I could not have contributed more than 50, 60 dollars during this entire time.

MR. DOYLE: You mean you were connected with this one cell from 1941 to 1945, inclusive, yet you only paid a total of 50 or 60 dollars in those four years?

MR. PARKS: Well, the dues, as I recall, when you weren't working were about 75 cents a month, as I recall, and if you were working I think you paid some percentage. I didn't.

MR. DOYLE: To what organization did you pay the dues as a member of the cell?

MR. PARKS: I gave them to -- right at the meeting.

MR. DOYLE: In check?

MR. PARKS: No, I believe I gave them in cash.

MR. DOYLE: Did you get a receipt for it?

MR. PARKS: No.

MR. DOYLE: Didn't ask for one?

MR. PARKS: Didn't ask for it.

MR. DOYLE: You mentioned that the cell members during the war discussed how the war was going. What did you mean by that?

MR. PARKS: Well, at that particular time, this I think was the major topic of conversation for most people in the country, and this was certainly true of myself and the actors that were at these particular meetings.

MR. DOYLE: Were there ever any resolutions submitted to the cell for consideration and action? I mean were ever any communications read to you in the meeting from any other segment of the Communist Party, the Communist organization? Did you ever listen to any communications read to you in any cell meeting those four years? If so, what?

MR. PARKS: I honestly cannot say that I ever heard any such communication. I don't believe so.

MR. DOYLE: Well, did anyone ever give you a report of any kind on Communist Party activities in those four years at any of these cell meetings? If so, what report? Weren't you interested in the progress of the Communist Party? Didn't anyone send you reports or give you an oral report?

MR. PARKS: Well, I think that certain things were mentioned at some of these meetings that a certain number

of people had been approached as far as our particular group was concerned, and this was about the extent of it as I recall.

MR. DOYLE: That was going to be my next question. Basing this question on the fact that you deliberately laid the groundwork that you were idealistic, liberal and progressive at the age of 25, and so forth, and that is perhaps one reason you joined the Communist Party, or at least you gave it as one reason for your joining it, --

MR. PARKS: No, that is the reason.

MR. DOYLE: Well, of course, --

MR. PARKS: I gave it as the reason.

MR. DOYLE: May I ask this? You have just stated now that reports were made as to people being approached. Now, you made an effort, didn't you, as a member of the cell-- Didn't that cell make efforts to increase its own membership in Hollywood?

MR. PARKS: I personally, to the best of my knowledge, never made such an effort.

MR. DOYLE: No, but you heard reports of what was being done by the cell?

MR. PARKS: That's correct.

MR. DOYLE: Well, what reports were given as to the activities of the cell?

MR. PARKS: Well, I don't remember. It's been a long time ago as I told you. And I'm not trying to evade this

question at all. I'm honestly not. But a minor report was probably made. I don't recall substances of any of these.

That --

MR. DOYLE: Well, now, you notice, Parks, I'm deliberately avoiding at this time asking you names of any other person.

MR. PARKS: Yes.

MR. DOYLE: For the purpose of my questioning I am assuming you want to be helpful to the Committee and tell the activities of the cell that you were in.

MR. PARKS: That's correct, and I am doing this.

MR. DOYLE: Now, manifestly, the cell was trying to increase its membership, wasn't it?

MR. PARKS: That's correct.

MR. DOYLE: And you were a member of the cell?

MR. PARKS: That's correct.

MR. DOYLE: You testified that you heard reports --

MR. PARKS: Well, as I say --

MR. DOYLE: -- of what the cell was doing to increase its membership.

MR. PARKS: Well, you're really going a bit further than I said, Congressman.

MR. DOYLE: Well, you go as far as you honestly can and tell us what activities the cell participated in to increase its membership.

MR. PARKS: Well, I think that certain members of the

group approached people about becoming a member of the Communist Party. I myself never did this. I have never --

MR. DOYLE: Well, names were submitted of other prospective members in your presence, were they not? Names of prospective members were read off or possibilities were read off or submitted to the cell membership, weren't they?

MR. PARKS: It's possible that this was done.

MR. DOYLE: Well, was it done?

MR. PARKS: As I say, it's been a long time ago. I'm not evading the question at all. But, as I told you, I attended a very few meetings. I was not considered a good member. I'm not clear and articulate about everything that happened, because I know very little of what happened.

MR. DOYLE: Well, was any difference in philosophy between communism and our form of government ever discussed in the cell? What did you discuss besides drinking coffee?

MR. PARKS: Well, we didn't discuss drinking coffee; we just drank it. As I told you, at that particular time the war was going on, and this was of major importance to every American at the time, and this, as I recall, was the major topic of conversation most of the time.

Then, the discussions also evolved around current events of the time. They also had to do with conditions of actors, as we were, as I recall, all actors: how we could get more money and better conditions.

These were the major topics of conversation as I recall them.

MR. DOYLE: Well, was it discussed amongst you that you could get more money as a member of the Communist Party than you could just being a plain Democrat or Republican or member of some other party or not being a member of any party?

MR. PARKS: No, this was never discussed to my knowledge at all. And, as a matter of fact, --

MR. DOYLE: What was the Communist Party membership in this cell going to do for you in Hollywood? What were the benefits of it? Why did you join the cell? What did you get out of it or hope to get out of it?

MR. PARKS: As I told you, as a young man of 25 with ideals and a feeling for the underdog I felt at the time that this was a legitimate political party -- like you would join the Democrats or Republicans -- and --

MR. DOYLE: When did you first begin to feel-- I don't mean to interrupt.

MR. PARKS: Excuse me. Could I just continue?

MR. DOYLE: I think you gave that answer a few minutes ago, the same answer you are giving now.

MR. PARKS: No, I really didn't. I felt at the time that this was the most liberal of the political parties of the time. You might be interested to know that all of this time I was a registered Democrat. I still am. And I have

voted from that time and before it the straight Democratic ticket, because this was the practical thing to do. The other was an idealistic thing.

MR. DOYLE: Now, may I ask you this, my final question I think for now: You were in that cell from 1941 to 1945, inclusive, as I understand your answer?

MR. PARKS: As I said, from 1941, as I recall, to 1944 or 1945.

MR. DOYLE: Approximately.

MR. PARKS: Approximately that.

MR. DOYLE: About how many years were you in that cell before you began to be disillusioned -- the proposition that perhaps the party you joined was not the answer to your idealism? How long did it take you to come to that conclusion before you dropped out?

MR. PARKS: Well, "disillusion" is not the exact word that I would choose, I don't think, at that particular time.

MR. WOOD: Do I understand from that answer, sir, that you are not yet disillusioned about it?

MR. PARKS: No, no. Don't bend it. Because I don't mean it that way at all. I am answering this Congressman's question to the best of my knowledge that it wasn't a question of disillusionment really at that time. It was a question of lack of interest, of not finding -- you may call it disillusionment if you want, but not finding the things

that as a young man with those particular feelings -- not finding the things that I thought I would find.

MR. DOYLE: Were most of the 12 or 15 occasions on which you attended in 1941, 1942 and 1943, or were most of them in 1944 and 1945? How would you estimate?

MR. PARKS: Well, it would be hard for me to estimate that, because when I was-- I began to work more, and when I worked I didn't go. And it would be hard for me to say, through this lack of interest in not finding what as a young man I was looking for, whether these were at the beginning or the end. I do know that it just petered out like a spent rocket.

MR. KEARNEY: Will the gentleman yield?

MR. DOYLE: I just want one more question.

Mr. Parks, of course you were well acquainted with some of the members of the cell?

MR. PARKS: Could I just explain one other thing when I say when I worked I didn't go? If you know anything about an actor's work, it goes from six in the morning till seven-thirty, eight at night, and when you do work you really don't have much time for anything else. And I have finished my forty-first picture in ten years. And this means I have been working pretty hard.

MR. DOYLE: I greatly respect the dedication of you artists to your profession and the diligence with which you

work at it. Now, let me ask this further question: You, of course, in these four or five years became acquainted with some of the members of the cell?

MR. PARKS: With what?

MR. DOYLE: You became acquainted with some other members of the cell so you had a talking acquaintance at least?

MR. PARKS: That's correct.

MR. DOYLE: Now, did you ever discuss with some other members of the cell the fact that you were becoming less satisfied or not satisfied? That is, that you didn't find in the Communist Party membership that which you had hoped?

MR. PARKS: I believe that I did.

MR. DOYLE: With men or women?

MR. PARKS: This I cannot recall. But I am sure-- I don't recall the conversations, but I am sure that these did take place.

MR. DOYLE: What was the substance of their expressed attitude to you? Did they agree with you or did they disagree with you?

MR. PARKS: Well, as I recall, many times people agreed with what I felt, how I felt. This is one of the reasons that I feel as I do about the people that I knew at that particular time, because I don't recall any time anyone giving me a really serious argument about the way I felt.

MR. DOYLE: While you were a member of that cell from

1941 to 1945, did it come at all clearly to you that the Communist Party was part of an international conspiracy against our form of government? Did you ever come to that conclusion while you were a member of the cell?

MR. PARKS: No, not while I was a member of that particular group. As I told you, I didn't find the things that I had hoped to find.

MR. KEARNEY: Will the gentleman yield at this point?

MR. DOYLE: Let me ask this last question. I appreciate your generosity, General.

Did you, while a member of that cell, come to the conclusion either in part or in whole that the Communist Party program was aimed at world domination?

MR. PARKS: Not at that particular time I did not.

MR. DOYLE: When did you come to that conclusion, if at all?

MR. PARKS: Well, I think the way most everybody has come to that conclusion, with the recent and not so recent events in the history of the world, in the history of our country.

MR. DOYLE: One more question.

MR. PARKS: This what is happening now. I think this is self-evident to most everybody.

MR. DOYLE: Did you make any effort yourself, Larry Parks, as a member of this cell, to increase its membership?

MR. VELDE: And you realize now that that judgment was wrong? That it actually was a subversive organization at that time?

MR. PARKS: I can only give you what I experienced myself, you see, what little I knew about it, and this is the only way that a man can judge.

MR. VELDE: I'm asking for your judgment at this time as to whether or not you were mistaken in your judgment and actually that the Communist Party was a subversive organization at that time.

MR. PARKS: Well, this is very hard for me to say. It really is. Because I honestly don't know. What I felt about it during that time, what I observed, that nothing wrong was ever done, you see.

MR. VELDE: It's not what you felt during that time, Mr. Parks. It's what you feel now about the Communist Party at that time.

MR. PARKS: What I feel now is entirely different than what I felt then.

MR. VELDE: In other words, now you feel that it was a subversive organization at that time?

MR. PARKS: I think a great change has occurred in this particular organization. This is my opinion.

MR. WALTER: In other words, you feel that the "do-gooders" have gotten out of it and there is nothing remaining now

except the hard-boiled politicians?

MR. PARKS: I would say that in substance I agree with this perfectly.

MR. VELDE: Mr. Parks, --

MR. PARKS: There possibly can be exceptions to this, but certainly not in the major part at all.

MR. VELDE: Mr. Parks, how could you possibly know how other members of your particular cell felt about the purposes of the organization -- that is, the Communist Party organization?

MR. PARKS: Well, at this particular time during the war, a common purpose united all of the people of this country, practically all of the people of this country.

MR. VELDE: I don't think you are answering my question, Mr. Parks. I realize your reluctance in telling the membership of your organization.

MR. PARKS: Would you repeat the question then? I didn't --

MR. VELDE: Just a moment. Let me finish, please. We had a witness down here last year, Lee Pressman, who was likewise reluctant to answer questions concerning his association with members of his own Communist Party cell, but eventually he did, and the Committee received his testimony, and it did the Committee a lot of good to realize that he would give the testimony. We realize that is true, and I

understand your reluctance, but I think you will agree that the Committee is a legally organized committee and has a function to do.

MR. PARKS: I agree with this perfectly.

MR. VELDE: And as such it has the right to inquire as to the names of members of the Communist Party during the past.

MR. PARKS: This is your right.

MR. WOOD: Mr. Counsel, did you have one further question before we adjourn?

MR. TAVENNER: Yes, sir. I would like to ask just one or two questions.

Mr. Parks, you are no doubt acquainted with Mr. Samuel G. Wood, a motion picture producer and director, or at least you were acquainted with him?

MR. PARKS: Well, I don't believe that I have ever met the gentleman. I'm quite-- If this is the man that died a year or two ago, --

MR. TAVENNER: Yes.

MR. PARKS: -- I'm an admirer of his work as a director. I don't believe I have ever met him. I don't recall meeting him.

MR. TAVENNER: But you know of whom I am speaking?

MR. PARKS: Yes, I do. Sam Wood? Right?

MR. TAVENNER: Yes. Now, he testified before this

Committee with regard to the Laboratory Theater as follows:

"Well, in the old days we used to have youngsters who had a chance to study to become actors and actresses through the stock companies. Every city had two or three stock companies. But now most of them have been eliminated. They have to go to these schools. They put on plays. They get parts. They study and become efficient, and we see them in the theaters or see them in some Pasadena Playhouse or something like that. But the Laboratory Theater I think is definitely under the control of the Communist Party and the people that teach there. Any kid that goes in there with American ideals hasn't a chance in the world."

Do you agree with his statement?

MR. PARKS: I disagree with this emphatically. I disagree with it emphatically.

MR. TAVENNER: But do you agree that Mr. Wood is a man of honor and integrity?

MR. PARKS: I agree that Mr. Wood is a man that turned out many fine motion pictures. I don't know the gentleman. I never knew him, and I don't recall ever having met him. But I disagree with this emphatically.

MR. TAVENNER: But do you still feel that in light of that testimony regarding Mr. Wood you should be the judge as to whether or not you testify as to who were connected with the theater --

MR. PARKS: No. At no time did I say that I was to be the judge. I was explaining my position to you. I have opened myself to you. And I am asking you gentlemen to be the judge, because this is not my duty here. I am a witness. You gentlemen must be the judge of this.

MR. TAVENNER: But you see there is a vast difference apparently between your opinion of the activities of that organization and the opinion of others who have testified before this Committee.

MR. PARKS: Well, let me tell you then about the activities of this organization, and then you form your own opinion. This I think would be the only fair thing to do.

MR. TAVENNER: Proceed.

MR. PARKS: The activities of the Lab I think were admirable. I didn't happen to agree with certain of the objectives from a professional point of view. This was my disagreement. The work of the Lab I think has been very fine. I think that from a standpoint of-- Mr. Wood was quite correct when he said that there is no place hardly today where an actor can get his training as he used to, except nowadays recently the summer theaters have come up.

I feel that the Actors Lab as a training ground for actors was probably the finest of its kind, with the finest courses and the finest directors. It had the cream of the talent appearing on its stages and for the army. I personally,

MR. PARKS: I do not recall ever making an effort to increase --

MR. DOYLE: Did you ever see or observe any other member of that cell do any act designed to increase the membership in the cell?

MR. PARKS: I personally don't recall ever having seen this, and this is an honest and truthful answer.

MR. KEARNEY: Mr. Chairman, --

MR. WOOD: General Kearney.

MR. KEARNEY: Mr. Parks, there was one portion of your testimony that I cannot understand. I cannot understand your lack of interest in the Communist Party, when, from your own testimony, no member of the Communist Party ever appeared at any of the meetings attended by yourself and spoke.

MR. PARKS: I don't understand the question. Would you repeat it?

MR. KEARNEY: Well, you testified some few minutes ago that no member of the Communist Party ever appeared before any of the meetings that you attended and spoke.

MR. PARKS: No, I don't believe I said this. I don't believe I said this at all.

MR. KEARNEY: That is my strong recollection of your testimony.

MR. PARKS: What I said, that to my recollection no --

I think I used the word "big shot."

MR. KEARNEY: Well, were there members of the Communist Party who appeared at your meetings and spoke to your group?

MR. PARKS: We were all at that particular time members of the Communist Party.

MR. KEARNEY: I mean from other cells outside of your own.

MR. PARKS: There was one instance that I do recall when this did happen.

MR. KEARNEY: Can you give his name?

MR. PARKS: Again I wish you would not press me.

MR. WOOD: I will state for the benefit of the members we are going to take a recess perhaps for a very short time for lunch, at which time I ask the Committee to assemble back in the room for the purpose of determining this matter of policy, and after we resume the witness will be advised what the disposition of this Committee is with reference to his apparent disinclination to answer questions.

MR. VELDE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask one question. I don't propose to prolong this discussion very much further. But, as I remember it, you stated that you now believe that the Communist Party of the United States is a subversive organization. Is that true?

MR. PARKS: I thought you were going on. Is that the

end?

MR. VELDE: Is that true?

MR. PARKS: Yes, I do.

MR. VELDE: But at that time that you went into the Communist Party, you felt that it was not a subversive organization?

MR. PARKS: That is quite correct.

MR. VELDE: Well, do you now know that at the time you belonged to the Communist Party that it actually was a subversive organization at that time?

MR. PARKS: Again this is only a personal opinion. What I observed at that time I cannot say that this was true. What I observed personally, the experiences that I had with the small group of people that I knew, this is the only way that I can judge.

MR. VELDE: Well, you have a pretty strong feeling though even at that time that you were duped, that you didn't actually know the purposes of the Communist Party? Isn't that true, Mr. Parks?

MR. PARKS: No. Again I say I will make no apologies, you see, for what I did except the mistake in judgment, and it's debatable.

MR. VELDE: Well, your judgment was at that time that it was not a subversive or disloyal organization?

MR. PARKS: This is my considered judgment.

for instance, appeared in three shows that we toured all over the army camps, like "Three Men on a Horse," "Arsenic and Old Lace," "Kiss and Tell." They had the greatest casts. You couldn't possibly have afforded these kind of casts on Broadway. No producer could be this rich. Because these people from the bits to the starring parts were giving of their time.

These are the reasons. I think the record of the Lab speaks for itself as far as its activities are concerned and the good that it has done. And I can't prove to you that it was a good acting school. This is impossible. But in my opinion as an actor, this was a fine acting school.

MR. TAVENNER: I am not questioning the skill of the group that were working there.

MR. PARKS: Yes.

MR. TAVENNER: I am talking about the influences --

MR. PARKS: That's right.

MR. TAVENNER: -- through Communist Party circles.

MR. PARKS: The only way that you can influence through an organization like the Lab, in my opinion, is by the kind of material and the way it is done. Now, if you go down the list of the plays and the classics and the modern plays that the Lab has done, everything from Shakespeare and before, playwrights of all countries, this is the only way I think that you can judge the worth of an organization like this.

MR. TAVENNER: Well, do you agree that it was the object and purpose of the Communist Party to exert an influence through the professionals in Hollywood in the advancement of the cause of communism?

MR. PARKS: No, I cannot agree with this at all.

MR. TAVENNER: Are you acquainted with the report on the National Convention in Relation to Cultural Movement by V. J. Jerome delivered in 1938?

MR. PARKS: No, I am not.

MR. TAVENNER: Well, let me read this paragraph to you:

"And further we must more than ever impress the professions, our friends and sympathizers, that we have a positive approach also to their work. It isn't just a question-- They shouldn't imagine that they are just brought into the party as though to be turned into instruments apart from their work, but on the contrary that their coming into the party was their being friends of the party and sympathizers as in terms of their actual work. We do not always make this clear. The party increasingly cherishes and values specific qualities that the professionals bring into our midst. Gone is the day when we just took a professional comrade and assigned him to do nondescript party work. We say, on the contrary, 'Comrades, you have something specific to give. You have the general contributions to make in your loyalty, in your dues payment, your attendance and your various duties

and tasks to perform, but you have also a different contribution to make, whether you are a writer, a film artist, a radio performer. We need this, no matter how valuable you are to the party on the picket line, and if in your turn you do not contribute you would not really be valuable to us.' This is important to register. And we must also register the fact that the party is not satisfied with anything save the best in terms of quality and caliber and talent that the comrades can produce. Our motto is nothing is too good for the working class, and not, as some say, and possibly by their inferior work, not because they are unable to do better but a sort of sloppy arrangement, that anything is good enough for the working class. We want quality. We want good leaflets, splendid posters such as the Communist Party of Germany used to put out when artists such as Kathe Kollwitz gave of their best to poster production, and, of course, murals and everything that is good. We want our basic agitational work to reflect that we have talented professionals in our midst, good sketches, good plays. In fact, unless the form is there the content is not there."

Doesn't that indicate to you a very definite and determined plan and perfected plan on the part of the Communist Party to use its Communist Party cells in the advancement of its program in Hollywood as well as elsewhere?

MR. PARKS: That would be my impression from listening

to you read that.

MR. TAVENNER: In the entertainment field?

MR. PARKS: I can only give you what I personally know and what my particular knowledge is on this, what my opinion is about certain things.

MR. JACKSON: Mr. Chairman, may I ask one question before we adjourn?

MR. WOOD: Yes, Mr. Jackson.

MR. JACKSON: Mr. Parks, why in your opinion were you solicited for membership in the Communist Party?

MR. PARKS: Well, I imagine I wasn't working at the time so it was not from a standpoint of getting any kind of working actor. I imagine that it was because I was young and probably, as I said, idealistic, and my views on the underprivileged and the underdog were probably known at the time, and I imagine that this was the reason.

MR. JACKSON: You think it had nothing to do with your potentialities as an actor? That you were solicited just as someone down on Skid Row might have been taken into the party?

MR. PARKS: Well, perhaps not quite to that extreme. I hope it wasn't quite to that extreme. But at the time-- I started to say I hate to admit it, but I really don't -- I was not considered to have much talent as an actor by many people. As a matter of fact, I'm rather proud now of a certain

progress that I have made I think as an actor myself. I always thought I had possibilities, but I was practically the only one that thought this. And I don't think that it was from that viewpoint that I was approached at all. I don't mean to give you a facetious answer, because it's not; this is true.

MR. JACKSON: You say today you are entirely out of sympathy with the Communist philosophy, with its manifestations as they have appeared in recent years since your separation from the party?

MR. PARKS: I certainly am. I think that any power that is trying to, in my opinion, take over the world in this manner I think is wrong.

MR. JACKSON: I think a concomitant of that would be then in case of conflict between the United States and the Soviet Union you would bear arms in defense of the United States?

MR. PARKS: Without question.

MR. WOOD: We will take a recess at this time until two-thirty.

(Thereupon, at 12:35 p.m., the hearing was recessed to reconvene at 2:30 p.m. this date.)

Edna McL
AAfls

AFTERNOON SESSION

The committee reconvened at 2:30 p.m., pursuant to the recess.

Mr. WOOD. The committee will be in order.

Let the record show that the members present are Messrs. Walter, Doyle, Frazier, Velde, Kearney, Jackson, Potter, and Wood.

Mr. MANDEL. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Parks would like to make a further application and talk to the committee about the question of naming names. He would appreciate it if the committee would hear him out a few minutes, what he has to say on the subject.

Mr. WOOD. I thought he expressed himself pretty fully this morning. We are taking a good deal of time on this hearing. I think counsel has a few more questions. Maybe they will bring out what he wants to say.

MR. MANDEL. What he has to say I think is very pertinent at this point. I don't think we can judge it until he says it. It will only take him three minutes or so to say it. In view of the fact he has cooperated so completely with the committee, I think he should be granted three minutes to say what he has to say, then he is willing to be guided by the committee.

Mr. WOOD. I see no objection to it. Make it as brief as you can, Mr. Parks.

Mr. PARKS. I will, Mr. Chairman.

TESTIMONY OF LARRY PARKS (Resumed)

Mr. PARKS. To be an actor, a good actor, you must really feel and experience, from the top of your head to the tip of your toes, what you are doing. As I told you, this is probably the most difficult morning and afternoon I have spent, and I wish that if it was at all possible--you see, it is a little different to sit there and to sit here, and for a moment if you could transfer places with me, mentally, and put yourself in my place.

My people have a long heritage in this country. They fought in the Revolutionary War to make this country, to create this Government, of which this committee is a part. I have two boys, one thirteen months, one two weeks. Is this the kind of heritage that I must hand down to them? Is this the kind of heritage that you would like to hand down to your children? And for what purpose? Children as innocent as I am or you are; people you already know.

I don't think I would be here today if I weren't a star, because you know as well as I, even better, that I know nothing that I believe would be of great service to this country.

I think my career has been ruined because of this, and I would appreciate not having to-- don't present me with the choice of either being in contempt of this committee and going to jail or forcing me to really crawl through the mud to be

an informer, for what purpose? I don't think this is a choice at all. I don't think this is really sportsmanlike. I don't think this is American. I don't think this is American justice. I think to do something like that is more akin to what happened under Hitler, and what is happening in Russia today.

I don't think this is American justice for an innocent mistake in judgment, if it was that, with the intention behind it only of making this country a better place in which to live. I think it is not befitting for this committee to force me to make this kind of a choice. I don't think it is befitting to the purpose of the committee to do this.

As I told you, I think this is probably the most difficult thing I have done, and it seems to me it would impair the usefulness of this committee to do this, because God knows it is difficult enough to come before this committee and tell the truth. There was another choice open to me. I did not choose to use it. I chose to come and tell the truth.

If you do this to me, I think it will impair the usefulness of this committee to a great extent, because it will make it almost impossible for a person to come to you, as I have done, and open himself to you and tell you the truth. So I beg of you not to force me to do this.

Mr. WOOD. Proceed.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Parks, there was a statement you made

this morning in the course of your testimony which interested me a great deal. This is what you said:

"This is a great industry,"--
speaking of the moving picture industry--

"and I don't say this only because it has been kind to me. It has a very important job to do, to entertain people; in certain respects to call attention to certain evils, but mainly to entertain."

Now, do you believe that the persons who are in a position to call attention to certain evils ought to be persons who are dedicated to the principles of democracy as we understand them in this country?

Mr. PARKS. I certainly agree with this completely.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you believe, on the other hand, that the persons who are in those responsible positions should be people who are antagonistic to the principles of democracy and our form of Government, and who are members of a conspiracy to overthrow our Government?

Mr. PARKS. Most assuredly I don't.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then what is your opinion as to whether or not members of the Communist Party should be in positions of power and influence in the various unions which control the writing of scripts, the actors, and various other things which we have mentioned during the course of this hearing relating to the great industry of the moving pictures?

Mr. PARKS. I thought I had made myself clear, my feeling about this, that I certainly do not believe that those people should be in any position of power to be able to direct this. Of course I don't believe that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Or to influence the course which it takes?

Mr. PARKS. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then we will ask your cooperation, before this hearing is over, in helping us to ascertain those who are or have been members of the Communist Party, for that particular purpose which we have mentioned.

Mr. Parks, it is generally known and recognized that the Communist Party, in order to function, must raise money by various methods. Will you tell us what you know of the methods by which money was raised to promote the objects and purposes of the Communist Party while you were a member?

Mr. PARKS. Well, unfortunately, I don't believe I am able to answer that, because I don't recall any occasion of that kind of raising this kind of money that you speak of. When I was a member of the Communist Party I paid dues to it, as I told you, and rather meager contributions. I don't believe I can help you on this, because I really don't know.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you take any part in fund-raising campaigns which were engineered by the Communist Party or by organisations known to you to be Communist-front organisations?

Mr. PARKS. I don't recall at the moment. This is like asking a man what he did in 1941, and he says, "I don't remember." If you say to him, "Did you go fishing up on the Oregon River?" he will say, "Yes, yes, I did." If you would accommodate me in this way perhaps I can answer your question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you make contributions to any organizations which you knew at the time or have known since to be cited as Communist-front organizations?

Mr. PARKS. I believe that before the Independent Artists' Committee, whatever it is called, was cited, I contributed to them two dollars a month.

Mr. TAVENNER. Over how long a period of time?

Mr. PARKS. A year or so, I guess. At the time it was to my mind a perfectly legitimate organization. It has been cited since, I believe, by the Attorney General in his list of organizations. Others might be. I don't recall them at the moment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you take part in any benefit performance, benefit celebration, on behalf of Communist-front organizations?

Mr. PARKS. As an actor, Counsel, I have taken part in many benefits for many organizations over the last ten years. If you could be more specific, perhaps I could answer better.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you taken part in any such celebra-

tion where the proceeds would go to a Communist-front organization which you knew had been cited as a Communist-front organization, or which you later found out had been cited?

Mr. PARKS. I don't remember at the moment, but if you could be more specific.

Mr. TAVENNER. No. I am asking if you recall.

Mr. PARKS. I don't recall at the moment. If you could be more specific, perhaps I could answer better.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know anything of Communist Party plans for raising money for various purposes in which the Communist Party was interested?

Mr. PARKS. No, I can't honestly recall knowing about this. Again, if you could be more specific, perhaps I could answer you more specifically, if you could give me an instance of what you want to know, or what you are driving at.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am merely asking what you know about the raising of Communist Party funds.

Mr. PARKS. At the moment I don't recall knowing anything about it. As I just told you, I have appeared in many benefits over the past few years for many organizations, and if you could be more specific perhaps I could be more specific. I am not trying to avoid the question.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no trick question here through which I am attempting to lead you into denial of something we know about.

Mr. PARKS. I have come here and have been as open and aboveboard as I can. I think the testimony will bear me out. I am willing to help you all I can if you could be more specific. As I told you, I have appeared at many benefits over many years.

Mr. TAVENNER. As far as you know, were any of these fund-raising benefits conducted for the benefit of the Communist Party?

Mr. PARKS. I don't recall any at the moment. But again I say, I have been to many benefits over many years.

Mr. TAVENNER. In your statement that you made at the beginning of the afternoon session, you made a statement which I cannot let go by without challenging it. You said you were subpoenaed here because you were a star. Mr. Parks, you were subpoenaed here because the committee had information that you had knowledge about Communist Party activities and that you had been a member.

Mr. PARKS. I did not mean any inference by that, Counsel. All I meant was that I think you know, even better than I, that I know nothing of any conspiracy that is trying to overthrow this Government. You know this even better than I. And my point was that I think if I was working in a drug store, I doubt very much whether I would be here.

Mr. TAVENNER. We have had many people before this committee who have been engaged in very menial forms of

making a livelihood, and that will be so in the future.

Mr. PARKS. Please don't take that in the wrong spirit, because it was not meant in the wrong spirit.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am glad it was not.

I did not fully understand your reference to the possible destruction of your career by being subpoenaed here. You did not mean to infer by that that this committee was bringing you here because of any effect it might have on your career?

Mr. PARKS. No, I didn't infer that at all. What I meant, and what I said, was that because of this, in my opinion, I have no career left.

Mr. TAVENNER. Don't you think that that question might be influenced to some extent by the fullness of the cooperation that you give the committee in a situation of this kind?

Mr. PARKS. I have tried to cooperate with the committee in every way that I feel that I can, but I think the damage has been done. This is my personal opinion.

Mr. TAVENNER. Those are all the questions I have at this time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOOD. Any questions?

Mr. JACKSON. Don't you think that more than the damage that possibly has been done you by this committee, which, after all, is an expression of the will of the American people and operates under the mandate of the people-- don't you think the great damage occurred when you became a

member of an organization which has been found to advocate the overthrow of every constitutional form of government in the world? Is this committee more to blame than your own act in affiliating with that organization?

Mr. PARKS. As I told you, Congressman, when I was a good deal younger than I am now, ten years ago, I felt a certain way about certain things. I was an idealist, I felt strongly and I still do about the underdog, and it was for these reasons that this particular organization appealed to me at that time. I have later found that this would not fulfill my needs. At that time this, I don't even believe was a mistake. It may have been a mistake in judgment. This is debatable. But my two boys, for instance, I would rather have them make the same mistake I did under those circumstances than not feel like making any mistake at all and be a cow in the pasture. If a man doesn't feel that way about certain things, then he is not a man. The thing that I did, I do not believe that I did anything that was wrong. Judgment, this is debatable. This I agree.

Mr. JACKSON. You say, Mr. Parks, that your association at best was haphazard, and, in your own words, you are afraid you were not a very good Communist.

Mr. PARKS. That is correct.

Mr. JACKSON. Upon what do you base the opinion that the people whose names you have in your possession probably

have severed their relations with the Communist Party or are not today members of the Communist Party?

Mr. PARKS. In my opinion the few people that I knew are people like myself and feel the way that I do.

Mr. JACKSON. Well, of course, that is merely your judgment of the matter. Have you discussed their Party affiliations with those with whom you were affiliated in the Party?

Mr. PARKS. I have not, but these people I knew, and this is my honest opinion. You know these people. You know them as well as I do.

Mr. JACKSON. I will point out to you that in a recent case here in Washington some of the highest officials in Government testified on the stand to their honest belief that a man with whom they had been associated had never been a member of the Communist Party, and in no way constituted any threat to our institutions, but every man who reads the newspapers knows how fallacious that opinion was. I merely point out that after all, in all good faith, you might conceivably be entirely wrong as to the present status of membership in the Communist Party of some people whose names you evidence hesitancy about disclosing.

Mr. PARKS. These men you speak of did not act as informers in any sense of the word. I told you about these people. You know who the people are. And I have told you

my opinion of them. And I have told you that I think to force me to do something like this is not befitting this committee. I don't think the committee would benefit from it, and I don't think this is American justice to make me choose one or the other or be in contempt of this committee, which is a committee of my Government, or crawl through the mud for no purpose, because you know who these people are. This is what I beg you not to do.

Mr. JACKSON. This is also problematic, Mr. Parks. I know who they are, maybe you are entirely right, but I still think it is within the province of the committee to determine how far they will go in this respect.

Mr. PARKS. I am asking the committee not to do it. I am not setting myself up as a judge. I am asking you to judge.

Mr. VELDE. I think you are wrong in assuming we know all of the activities in which you were engaged and all the people you were engaged in those activities with. I am satisfied you are wrong in that, and possibly you could furnish us with a lot of information we do not have, and I feel sure you would be willing to do that to serve the best interests of the United States, of which you are a citizen.

Mr. PARKS. I have told you to the best of my ability of my activities. You say you don't know mine. I have tried to tell you to the best of my ability of my activities.

Mr. WOOD. We will ask at this time to break in the

testimony of this witness to make an announcement concerning his release from the subpoena. I request that he not leave the jurisdiction of the committee until later this afternoon.

Mr. MANDEL. You want us around the rest of the afternoon?

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. MANDEL. Thank you.

(Witness temporarily excused.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Howard Da Silva.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Da Silva, will you please raise your right hand and be sworn.

Mr. KENNY. My name is Kenny. I am a Los Angeles attorney. As you recall, we sent a wire. I would ask that that motion be disposed of before he is sworn.

Mr. WOOD. The witness will be sworn. It won't interfere with any motion.

Mr. KENNY. The motion was to quash the subpoena. If he is not properly subpoenaed, if the motion is denied, of course the record has been made, but as it now stands there is a motion pending before the committee that the subpoena be quashed, on the ground that Mr. Da Silva is not a witness but rather a defendant in a proceeding which may have the effect of depriving him of his livelihood, and as such a defendant he cannot be called at all to testify against himself. That is why the motion was addressed to the subpoena. I suggest the logical way to handle that would be to grant or deny the motion to quash the subpoena, then if the motion is denied the record will be made and the witness will be available to be sworn.

Mr. WOOD. I don't think this committee has authority to rule on a legal question as to the subpoena. We have the power of subpoena, but that is a question that will have to be raised in court at the proper time.

Mr. KENNY. If the record discloses the motion has been made,--

Mr. WOOD. Let the record disclose that this telegram, in the nature of a motion, has been presented to the committee and will be placed in the record.

(The telegram above referred to is as follows:)

M.CA028 NL PD CHICAGO ILL 19= 1951 Mar 20 AM 2 41

HON. JOHN S. WOOD CHAIRMAN
HOUSE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES
HOUSE OFFICE BLDG.
WASH DC

DEAR SIR PLEASE TAKE NOTICE THAT THE UNDERSIGNED AS COUNSEL FOR GALE SONDERGAARD AND HOWARD DE SILVA WILL AT THE OPENING OF THEIR SCHEDULED EXAMINATION BEFORE YOU WEDNESDAY MARCH 21 1951 MOVE TO QUASH THE SUBPOENAS PREVIOUSLY SERVED ON EACH OF THEM THIS MOTION WILL BE MADE UPON THE GROUNDS THAT OUR CLIENTS HAVE NOT BEEN SUBPOENAED MERELY AS WITNESSES BUT RATHER THEY OCCUPY THE POSITION OF DEFENDANTS CHARGED WITH POLITICAL HERESY IN A PROCEEDING WHICH CAN RESULT IN DEPRIVATION OF THEIR LIVELIHOODS NO ONE IN SUCH A POSITION CAN BE CALLED TO THE STAND AND COMPELLED TO TESTIFY AGAINST HIMSELF (SEE FIRST AND FIFTH AMENDMENTS US CONSTITUTION ADAMSON V CALIFORNIA 332 US 46 BOYD V US 116 US 616): THIS MOTION PRESENTS A SERIOUS CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTION AND WE REQUEST AN OPPORTUNITY TO PRESENT ORAL ARGUMENT IN SUPPORT THEREOF RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED

ROBERT W KENNY AND BEN MARGOLIS LOS ANGELES
WASHINGTON DC ADDRESS THE SHOREHAM

Mr. WOOD. You solemnly swear the evidence you give this committee will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. DA SILVA. I do.

TESTIMONY OF HOWARD DA SILVA

Mr. DA SILVA. I should like to voice an objection, if I may.

Mr. WOOD. Just have a seat, please.

Mr. DA SILVA. May I voice an objection?

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, the telegram to which you referred was presented to the committee in executive session yesterday, and I understood it took action on it at the time.

Mr. WOOD. Are you represented by counsel here?

Mr. DA SILVA. I am.

Mr. WOOD. Will counsel please identify himself for the record?

Mr. KENNY. Robert Kenny, 250 North Oak Street, Los Angeles.

Mr. MARGOLIS. I am also appearing on behalf of Mr. Da Silva. My name is Ben Margolis, 112 West 9th Street.

Mr. WOOD. At any time you are asked a question by either counsel for this committee or any of its members, you have the privilege of conferring with your counsel to your entire satisfaction before making answer, and you are given that right at any time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state your full name, please?

Mr. DA SILVA. I would like to voice my objection now, if I may.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state your full name, please?

Mr. DA SILVA. May I not voice my objection?

Mr. TAVENNER. You have not yet been identified in the record.

Mr. DA SILVA. My name is Howard Da Silva. I was born Howard Silverblatt. I was born in Cleveland, Ohio, May 4, 1909.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you furnish the committee, please, with a brief resume of your educational background?

Mr. DA SILVA. Mr. Chairman, I have a statement which I would like very much to make. It has been announced in the press that this committee has as its purpose complete objectivity, and I think in the face of that it is quite important that I present my own statement here for clarity and for objectivity. Here is the statement I would like to present (handing statement to counsel).

Mr. TAVENNER. Is this the same statement that counsel sent in to the committee a while ago?

Mr. KENNY. No, I don't think we sent a statement in. It may be a statement of which you have seen a copy.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is it a statement that was given to the press?

Mr. DA SILVA. It was given to the press.

Mr. WOOD. This is a statement that you released to the press?

Mr. DA SILVA. What is that?

Mr. WOOD. This statement you now desire to read is a statement that you released to the press?

Mr. DA SILVA. Simultaneously with my appearance, yes.

Mr. WOOD. Let's see if I understand you correctly. When did you release this statement which you now propose to read?

Mr. DA SILVA. I was called here at ten o'clock this morning.

Mr. WOOD. When did you release the statement to the press?

Mr. DA SILVA. Shortly after I arrived here.

Mr. WOOD. Shortly after ten, and it is now after three. In the light of the fact it has been given this wide publicity, I see no purpose in burdening the record with a repetition of it.

Mr. DA SILVA. My purpose is not to burden the record. My purpose is to achieve the kind of objectivity which was originally stated to the press by this committee.

Mr. WOOD. Proceed with the questions.

Mr. DA SILVA. I don't follow you. Did you say my statement was not to be read?

Mr. WOOD. Yes, sir.

Mr. DA SILVA. It is not to be read.

Mr. TAVENNER. My question was, will you please furnish the committee a brief statement of your educational background?

Mr. DA SILVA. At this point, may I object to being called to testify against myself in this hearing. I object because the First and Fifth Amendments and all of the Bill of Rights protect me from any inquisitorial procedure, and I may not be compelled to cooperate with this committee in producing evidence designed to incriminate me and to drive me from my profession as an actor. The historical--

Mr. WOOD. Would an answer to that question incriminate you? You were asked to furnish a statement of your educational background. Would a true answer to that question incriminate you? If so, you have a right to protect yourself.

Mr. DA SILVA. You want me to make this objection at a time when I think an answer to the question will incriminate me?

Mr. WOOD. If a true answer to any question asked you by counsel or any member of this Committee would tend to incriminate you and you so swear, you have a right to claim it, as I understand the law.

Mr. MARGOLIS. It is our position that this witness is in the same position as a defendant, and I think he should be allowed to complete this objection.

Mr. WOOD. He is not a defendant here. He is a witness.

Mr. MARGOLIS. It is our contention that he is and will suffer the consequences and pains in many respects.

Mr. WOOD. He will suffer the consequences of testifying falsely, if he does so. If he refuses to answer without valid ground, he is subjecting himself, as you well know, to a proceeding for contempt of Congress. It is a matter you can advise him about. You have that privilege any time you want.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now will you answer the question, please?

Mr. DA SILVA. I attended the public schools of New York City; Bronx High School; and for a term, City College of New York.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you spend a term in City College of New York?

Mr. DA SILVA. I was born in 1919. I was about seventeen. That would make it about 1926.

I also attended Carnegie Tech in Pittsburgh for a short semester, working through college by working in the Jones Laughlin steel mill.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your present address?

Mr. DA SILVA. My present address is 936 North Stanley Avenue, Hollywood 46, California.

Mr. TAVENNER. And what is your present occupation?

Mr. DA SILVA. My present occupation is acting.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you ever held the position of vice

president of the Civil Rights Congress, that is, the New York Chapter of the Civil Rights Congress?

Mr. DA SILVA. Mr. Chairman, it is very clearly the object of this committee to tie me in with organizations which are in its disfavor, and therefore I object, and now I will tell you my objection.

Mr. WOOD. We are not interested in your objection. We are interested in knowing whether you will answer the question.

Mr. DA SILVA. I refuse to answer the question on the following basis: The First and Fifth Amendments and all of the Bill of Rights protect me from any inquisitorial procedure, and I may not be compelled to cooperate with this committee in producing evidence designed to incriminate me and to drive me from my profession as an actor. The historical origin of the Fifth Amendment is founded in the resistance of the people to attempts to prosecute and persecute individuals because of--

Mr. WOOD. Will you please wait a moment? Please ascribe to the committee the intelligence to determine these questions for itself, and don't argue about it.

Mr. DA SILVA. I don't care to argue about it, but I wish to clarify my position.

Mr. WOOD. You need not teach this committee a class in law.

Mr. DA SILVA. It is not my position. It is my position to uphold the law and to make sure the committee does.

Mr. WOOD. If you say you decline to answer for the reasons given, it will be understood.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you refuse to answer the question?

Mr. DA SILVA. I refuse to answer the question on the basis of my statement here, on the basis that my answer might, according to the standards of this committee, tend to incriminate me.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you go to the State of California for employment, how long ago?

Mr. DA SILVA. I think for the first time in 1939, when I appeared in "Abe Lincoln in Illinois."

Mr. TAVENNER. Prior to 1939 how were you employed and where?

Mr. DA SILVA. I was an actor on Broadway.

Mr. TAVENNER. Over what length of time were you an actor on Broadway?

Mr. DA SILVA. I served my apprenticeship in 1929 with the Civic Repertory Theater, so from 1929 to 1939 I served as an actor on Broadway.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you connected at any time with the Federal Theater Project in New York?

Mr. DA SILVA. Yes, I was, and I was very proud to be. That was the advent of a magnificent period, and I think some of the greatest work that ever came out came out at that time; truly a people's theater.

Mr. TAVENNER. How large an organization was it?

Mr. DA SILVA. In the Federal Theater?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. DA SILVA. I think it is a matter of record, but there were many hundreds of actors in the Federal Theater all over the country. The audience was many millions of Americans, who for 55 cents could see plays they had never seen before and would not have had an opportunity to see otherwise.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was it privately financed, or Government financed?

Mr. DA SILVA. It is a part of the public record that it was Government financed.

Mr. TAVENNER. At that time, while you were a member of it, were you a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. DA SILVA. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the most vital concern of this committee is to really control every concept of free thought throughout the country, to do it by attacking Hollywood, and --

Mr. WOOD. This committee is not interested in your opinion. Do you decline to answer the question, or will you answer it?

Mr. DA SILVA. It is necessary that I answer it in my own way. It seems vital to say that the object of this committee is a smokescreen. Nobody either in Washington or Hollywood thinks there is a group in Hollywood dedicated to

overthrow Southern California by force and violence.

Mr. WOOD. You were asked a very simple question, whether at the time you were a member of the organization you were asked about, you were a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. DA SILVA. Because the very clear intention of this committee is to tie me in with an organization in its disfavor, I refuse to answer the question for the reasons previously stated.

Mr. WOOD. Let it be understood this committee is not trying to tie you in anywhere. We are endeavoring to find where you tied yourself.

Mr. DA SILVA. I have a function as a citizen, but I think in this period of war hysteria it is the purpose of this committee to pull the wool over the eyes of the people.

MR. WOOD. The committee is not interested in your opinions. We are anxious to get the facts.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you attempt to recruit persons into the Communist Party from the Federal Theater Project while you were a member of the Federal Theater Project?

Mr. DA SILVA. I decline to answer that question for the same reasons previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. After going to Hollywood, did you become affiliated with the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee there?

Mr. DA SILVA. Mr. Chairman, there is a rumor that those who have been anti-German in the last war will be brought before

this committee. I must decline to answer the question for reasons previously given.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, cannot the witness be made to answer "yes" or "no" or to decline to answer on the grounds he might incriminate himself, without going into a speech.

Mr. WOOD. It would certainly be appreciated by the committee if he would not air his views and would answer the questions more directly.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you been affiliated with the Actors Laboratory in Hollywood?

Mr. DA SILVA. Once again, because it is the purpose of this committee to link me with an organization it considers unfavorable, I decline to answer this question on grounds previously stated.

Mr. WOOD. Any further comment by you as to the object of this committee will be ignored by the reporter.

Mr. DA SILVA. I didn't hear you, sir.

Mr. WOOD. From now on I order stricken from the record any comment by you as to the object of this committee.

Mr. DA SILVA. They seem to me apropos, sir.

Mr. WOOD. I will permit it to remain so far, but I will not permit you to continue to repeat that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you sign a statement which appeared in the Daily Worker of February 28, 1949, which defended the twelve Communist Party leaders who were convicted of

conspiracy to overthrow the Government of the United States by force and violence?

Mr. DA SILVA. I decline to answer for reasons previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you register as a member of the Communist Party in 1944 and in 1945?

Mr. DA SILVA. I decline to answer this question for the reasons previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you married when you went to California, I believe you said in 1938 or 1939? When did you go to California, what was the date?

Mr. DA SILVA. I don't recall the specific date that I went to California, but is the matter of my marriage or my personal relations pertinent to this inquiry?

Mr. TAVENNER. It certainly is.

Mr. DA SILVA. In what respects, may I ask?

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you married while you were in California, and was your wife's name Evelyn?

Mr. DA SILVA. I still don't understand in what respect this question is pertinent to the inquiry of this committee.

Mr. WOOD. Do you think an answer to that would incriminate you?

Mr. DA SILVA. I should think I would be entitled to find out if it was pertinent or not.

Mr. WOOD. You have competent counsel, I assume. In fact,

I know you have.

Mr. KENNY. Thank you.

Mr. WOOD. Just advise your client.

Mr. KENNY. I have advised him that the protection of Jones against SEC--

Mr. WOOD. Please advise your client.

Mr. KENNY. He has asked the committee to state wherein this question is pertinent to the inquiry.

Mr. WOOD. It is a matter of your advising your client and letting him make up his own mind as to what course he wants to take.

Mr. DA SILVA. Apparently any answer which I make has to be specifically pertinent, is that correct? In other words, I can't answer the question in my own way.

I will answer that question. I think I was divorced from my first wife when I went to California in 1939. I believe that to be the fact. To the best of my knowledge I think that is true.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether she is now living in Norfolk, Virginia?

Mr. DA SILVA. No. I don't know anything about her. I haven't been in communication with her for a long time.

MR. TAVENNER: Do you know whether she has since remarried?

MR. DA SILVA: I have heard somewhere that she was remarried, yes.

MR. TAVENNER: Would you know her husband's name if I mentioned it?

MR. DA SILVA: I don't think I could say what her husband's name is.

MR. TAVENNER: Was she engaged in any Communist Party activities at any time prior to your divorce or since, to your knowledge?

MR. DA SILVA: I have many relations, and the activity which they have engaged in I have in no way made my concern, but I can tell you once again it obviously is your purpose to tie me in with any activity of hers and through us both with associations which are in your disfavor. I must decline to answer this question for the same reasons previously stated.

MR. TAVENNER: You declined to answer the question as to whether or not you were a member of the Communist Party when you were in New York between 1936 and approximately 1938. Have you been a member of the Communist Party since then, and are you a member of the Communist Party now?

MR. DA SILVA: I decline to answer this question on the grounds previously stated.

MR. TAVENNER: You appear here in response to a subpoena which was served on you on February 24th by James A. Andrews,

investigator for this committee?

MR. DA SILVA: Yes.

MR. TAVENNER: I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

MR. WOOD: Mr. Potter.

MR. POTTER: Mr. Da Silva, you in your statement said you felt that you were a loyal American; is that true?

MR. DA SILVA: You mean in my statement?

MR. POTTER: Yes. I believe in your statement you made some reference to loyal Americans and you included yourself as being a loyal American; is that true?

MR. DA SILVA: Mr. Chairman, my specific statement, which has not been returned to me and which is here, says specifically that my love for this country is deep enough for me to be able to distinguish between its people and its policies of the moment. I will always identify myself with the interests of the American people, but I will support or oppose my government's policies to the extent that I understand them to serve or harm the people of the country.

MR. POTTER: Then you feel that our Government's policies today you cannot support?

MR. DA SILVA: Mr. Chairman, I think the overwhelming majority of people in this country are --

MR. POTTER: That is a simple answer.

MR. DA SILVA: This is a simple answer which I must answer in my own simple way. I feel --

MR. WOOD: Make it brief.

MR. DA SILVA: Are you about to time me? I feel it is very essential I make this statement.

MR. WOOD: Please. Let us get along with the hearing. You were asked simple questions, whether or not you could support and feel like you can support the policies of the Government of the United States. That is a question you can answer very simply, without giving us a lecture here on the subject.

MR. DA SILVA: Mr. Chairman --

MR. WOOD: Do you or don't you?

MR. DA SILVA: My opinions are my own. My opinions belong to me. My opinions, present, past, and future, belong to me.

MR. POTTER: Then you refuse to answer?

MR. DA SILVA: Your question again is what?

MR. POTTER: Do you feel that you can support the policies of our government at this time, or do you support the policies of our government at this time?

MR. DA SILVA: Which specific policies, Mr. Chairman.

MR. POTTER: For example, if the Soviet Union should attack the United States will you support and would you bear arms for the United States?

MR. DA SILVA: Mr. Chairman, the prime issue of the day is peace, not ways of waging war. Your obvious intent once again is to tie me with organizations that you consider subversive. Any word "peace" today is considered subversive by this

committee and by those who prefer war to peace.

I decline to answer this question on the grounds previously stated.

MR. POTTER: If the witness could confine his acting to Hollywood I am sure the committee would progress much faster.

MR. DA SILVA: Is it the committee's object here to uphold the law? It is the committee which is seeking publicity.

MR. POTTER: I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

MR. WOOD: Mr. Jackson?

MR. JACKSON: No questions.

MR. KEARNEY: Are you in favor of the Communist-inspired peace marches on Washington?

MR. DA SILVA: Mr. Kearney, my opinions on peace have been many, and I have made them over a period of many years.

MR. KEARNEY: No further questions.

MR. DA SILVA: But today, when the purpose is to link the word "peace" and the word "subversive" all over America, I refuse to answer this question on the basis previously stated.

MR. WOOD: Mr. Velde.

MR. VELDE: Do you think this is a legally organized committee of Congress?

MR. DA SILVA: A legally organized committee of Congress?

MR. VELDE: Yes.

MR. DA SILVA: I think its actions have been decidedly illegal. I think its actions have been for the specific purpose

of pulling wool over Americans eyes.

MR. VELDE: Do you think the Congress has a right to inquire into subversive activities in the United States of America?

MR. DA SILVA: I think that Congress has many rights. The least of its rights are the freedom to wage war today.

MR. VELDE: I would appreciate a specific answer.

MR. DA SILVA: Would you voice your question again?

MR. VELDE: Do you believe that the Congress has a right to inquire into subversive and disloyal activities in the United States?

MR. DA SILVA: Well, this is obviously what this committee is doing at present.

MR. VELDE: Do you believe that we have that right?

MR. DA SILVA: I think that the overwhelming majority of the American people want peace and don't want to drop an atom bomb. I think that is the most pressing issue of the day. I think that any attempt to investigate so-called subversive organizations is an attempt to pull wool over the American people's eyes, the old Army game, to say "Look what is happening there, and meanwhile we pick your pockets and drop atom bombs." That is the real function.

MR. VELDE: I think you are not answering the question.

MR. DA SILVA: I am answering the question as specifically as I can. It has been said before. This is part of the same

and Mr. Walter say it sounds like the "Daily

Worker." I recognize that every statement made which is on peace or on any issue that you find in your disfavor is called an issue that sounds like the "Daily Worker" or an issue that is subversive or an issue that is questionable. To me the question of peace today is not a subversive issue.

MR. WOOD: Mr. Frazier.

MR. FRAZIER: No questions.

MR. DOYLE: I think in view of this witness' statement that this committee is not interested in peace that I want to challenge that statement. I challenge it publicly and say to this witness that this committee is interested in peace, and I as a member of this committee am interested in peace. But I am not interested in protecting Communists or subversives in connection with their alleged peace program. I want this witness to know that I as an American very much resent his statement to this committee that this committee is not interested in peace, because we are, Mr. Da Silva.

MR. DA SILVA: Mr. Doyle, you are from California. What program of peace are you in favor of? What kind of peace do you want, Mr. Doyle?

MR. KEARNEY: Will the gentleman from California yield to me?

MR. DOYLE: I do.

MR. KEARNEY: I will say the gentleman from California is not in favor of the Communists' plans for peace.

MR. DA SILVA: Would you tell me what plans for peace you are in favor of in this country?

MR. KEARNEY: Yes, I could, but not here, because you have made many a speech here and you are not going to make any more as far as I am concerned.

MR. DA SILVA: I see.

MR. WOOD: Any further questions, Mr. Doyle?

MR. DOYLE: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. WOOD: Mr. Walter, any further questions?

MR. WALTER: No.

MR. WOOD: Any further questions by counsel?

MR. TAVENNER: One further question, if you please.

The "Daily Worker" dated July 8, 1937, at page 5, announced that Howard De Silva would be a member of the cast of a play to be presented at the 75th birthday celebration of Mother Bloor. Did you take part in that celebration?

MR. DA SILVA: Your purpose is very clearly indicated, to link me with organizations or people that you find in disfavor. I decline to answer this question for the reasons previously stated.

MR. TAVENNER: Do you know Will Geer?

MR. DA SILVA: Will Geer? He is a fine actor. I have known him for years.

MR. TAVENNER: Did he direct the play on the occasion that I mentioned?

MR. DA SILVA: Which one again?

MR. TAVENNER: The 75th birthday of Mother Bloor.

MR. DA SILVA: Once again your purpose is to link Will Geer and me through an association that you find in disfavor with you. I will not support that. I decline to answer this question on the grounds previously stated.

MR. WOOD: The answer of the witness is that he declines to answer for the reasons stated.

MR. TAVENNER: I have no further questions.

MR. WOOD: Very well.

MR. MARGOLIS: We would like to have this made a part of the record. This is merely a request that this objection which this witness started to read and which the committee did not permit him to complete be made a part of the record, so that it may be clear as to what grounds he stands on in refusing to answer these questions.

MR. WOOD: I have no objection to that.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

I object to being called to testify against myself in this hearing. The First and Fifth Amendments and all of the Bill of Rights protect me from any inquisitorial procedure, and I may not be compelled to cooperate with this Committee in producing evidence designed to incriminate me and to drive me from my profession as an actor. The historical origin of the Fifth Amendment is founded in the resistance of the people to attempts to prosecute and

persecute individuals because of their beliefs, their speech, their writings, and their associations. Therefore, if despite my objection to being required to testify at all, I am nevertheless compelled to take the stand, I shall exercise the great historical right under the Fifth Amendment to refuse to give answers which may tend to incriminate me in this period of hysteria and political persecution. I claim this as a privilege extended to every American by our Constitution. In defending my rights against self-incrimination and to privacy of belief, I am also trying to prevent the final destruction of our rights to freedom of speech, opinion and association.

MR. WOOD: That will be all.

MR. TAVENNER: Miss Gale Sondergaard.

MR. WOOD: Will you be sworn.

SWORN TESTIMONY OF EDITH HOLM SONDERGAARD

MR. WOOD: Do you solemnly swear the evidence you give this committee shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

MISS SONDERGAARD: I do.

MR. KENNY: For the record, the same objection to the witness being called at all which was made at the outset of the witness Da Silva is repeated in behalf of Miss Sondergaard at this time.

MR. WOOD: It will be included in the record.

MR. TAVENNER: Will you please state your full name?

MISS SONDERGAARD: My name is known professionally as Gale Sondergaard. I was born Edith Holm Sondergaard in Litchfield, Minnesota.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might be allowed to read a statement. I find it difficult to express myself, and I have worked this up.

MR. WOOD: Not until you have been examined. If you have a statement you want to file with the committee for the record after you have answered the questions that are asked you, you can leave it with the reporter.

MR. TAVENNER: You are an actress by profession, I believe.

MISS SONDERGAARD: I am an actress by profession.

MR. TAVENNER: What is your married name?

MISS SONDERGAARD: My married name is Mrs. Herbert Biberman.

MR. WOOD: You are represented by the same counsel that represented the previous witness. We will dispense with the necessity of further indentifying yourselves.

MR. TAVENNER: I believe you are here in response to a subpoena as served on you on March 21, 1951, are you not?

MISS SONDERGAARD: That's true.

MR. TAVENNER: Will you please relate to the committee briefly your educational background?

MISS SONDERGAARD: Yes. I went to high school in

Minneapolis, Minnesota. I graduated from the University of Minnesota. I attended the Minneapolis School of Dramatic Art.

MR. TAVENNER: Will you give the committee a brief resume of your employment background?

MISS SONDERGAARD: Yes. I began on a touring Shakespearean company. As a matter of fact, I began acting when I was still in college, during the summers. Then I would go back to school. Then I went on a Shakespearean tour. I worked with Jesse Bonstede in Detroit for two years as her second lady and then her leading lady. I worked with the Theater Guild for a number of years as one of their acting company. I worked in many Broadway plays. I went to Hollywood and I have been there for the past six years.

MR. TAVENNER: What guilds or associations have you been identified with in Hollywood?

MISS SONDERGAARD: Guilds or associations?

MR. TAVENNER: Yes.

MISS SONDERGAARD: Would you be a little more specific on that question, because I think the two names mean two different things.

MR. TAVENNER: What organizations have you belonged to in Hollywood?

MISS SONDERGAARD: Mr. Chairman, before I came here I followed a great deal of the testimony of this committee, and I have read a long, long list of organizations which you on

the committee and which other committees of our Government have branded as subversive organizations. I have a feeling if you will ask me what organizations I belonged to that you probably would like me to tie myself into one of these, and there I must refuse to answer this question on the grounds of the Fifth Amendment, that it might tend to incriminate me.

MR. TAVENNER: Are you a member of the Screen Actors Guild?

MISS SONDERGAARD: I am a member of the Screen Actors Guild. All actors must belong to the Screen Actors Guild. It is a trade union.

MR. TAVENNER: Are there to your knowledge members of the Communist Party in that guild?

MISS SONDERGAARD: Mr. Chairman, I don't know anything about personnel of our guild. I know that we are all trade union people. We belong together because we are professional workers in the motion picture industry.

MR. WOOD: You were asked if to your knowledge there were any members of the Communist Party that were members of this guild since you belong to it.

MISS SONDERGAARD: Mr. Chairman, obviously that question is designed to involve me, to incriminate me. I shall have to refuse to answer that question on the basis previously

stated.

MR. WOOD: Do you so refuse?

MISS SONDERGAARD: What was that? Do I refuse? For the reasons previously stated.

MR. TAVENNER: Have you observed during the course of your membership in that guild an organization on behalf or on the part of the Communists to dominate or to advance the Communist Party within that organization?

MISS SONDERGAARD: Mr. Prosecutor, I know that there are a great many people --

MR. WOOD: Just answer the question.

MISS SONDERGAARD: I must refuse to answer that question on the grounds previously stated.

MR. WOOD: Do you refuse to answer?

MISS SONDERGAARD: I said I did refuse.

MR. WOOD: You must say you refuse to answer.

MISS SONDERGAARD: I am sorry. I didn't hear you.

MR. WOOD: When you say you must refuse to answer, it isn't an answer. The question is: Do you answer?

MISS SONDERGAARD: I am sorry. I do mean that.

MR. WOOD: For the reasons that you have given?

MISS SONDERGAARD: For the reasons previously stated.

MR. TAVENNER: Are you familiar with an organization called the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship?

MISS SONDERGAARD: Mr. Chairman, again I must refer to

your long list of organizations and refuse to answer that question on the basis previously stated. May I say something while we are waiting here about this business of suddenly branding every progressive and every progressive organization in our country, organizations which have done wonderful and fine work in the past, branding them as subversive? This I find very shocking and very saddening.

MR. TAVENNER: Are you a member of the Communist Party at this time or have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

MISS SONDERGAARD: I refuse to answer that question for the reasons previously stated.

MR. TAVENNER: Miss Sondergaard, the committee is in possession of information which discloses that on December 1, 1944, you were registered as a Communist, and your card bore the number 47328 for the year 1945; that is, the card bore that number for the year 1945. Do you wish to deny or affirm that information or explain it?

MISS SONDERGAARD: I refuse to answer the question on the grounds previously stated.

MR. TAVENNER: Are you making a distinction in your own mind about the Communist Party or the Communist political association, because those terms are often used interchangeably?

MISS SONDERGAARD: I refuse to answer that question on the terms previously stated.

MR. TAVENNER: Was your Communist Party number in 1944 the number 46943?

MISS SONDERGAARD: I refuse to answer that question for the reasons previously stated.

MR. TAVENNER: You are familiar, I assume, with an organization called the Motion Picture Artists Committee?

MISS SONDERGAARD: Mr. Chairman, I believe that is on the long, long list of what are now known as subversive organizations, and I refuse to answer it for the reasons previously stated.

MR. TAVENNER: Have you been a sponsor at any time of the League of Women Shoppers?

MISS SONDERGAARD: I refuse to answer that question for the reasons previously stated.

MR. KEARNEY: I would like to ask the witness this question, and I think that it calls for a yes or no answer.

Do you believe a committee of Congress should investigate subversive activities or the security of our country?

MISS SONDERGAARD: Mr. Congressman, I do believe that a committee of Congress could and should do investigating work, but I do feel that this committee at this time is doing incriminating work much more than investigating work, and that is the reason I wish to object.

MR. KEARNEY: You wouldn't like to go over some of our files, would you?

MR. TAVENNER: Miss Sondergaard, the records of the committee disclose that you served as a sponsor of the Cultural and Scientific Congress for World Peace which was held in the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City March 25th to 27th, 1949, under the auspices of the National Council of Arts, Sciences, and professions. Is that correct?

MISS SONDERGAARD: It is a very odd thing that whenever the word "peace" comes up people begin to tremble. I must refuse to answer that question for the reasons previously stated.

MR. TAVENNER: The "Daily Worker" of June 23, 1950, states that you were scheduled to speak at the rally on June 28, 1950, in Madison Square Garden under the auspices of the Civil Rights Congress. On June 29, 1950, the newspaper stated that rally was staged in behalf of the eleven national Communist Party leaders who had been convicted of conspiracy to advocate the overthrow of the Government by force and violence, as well as in behalf of Eugene Dennis, Communist Party national secretary, who was jailed for contempt of Congress.

Other speakers on the program, according to the newspaper account, were identified as Gus Hall, who was one of the eleven convicted Communist Party leaders, the avowed Communist Ben Gold, Paul Robeson, Vito Marcantonio, Ring Lardner, Jr., and Earl Coward.

I would like to ask you to tell us all you know about the selection of the speakers on that occasion and your participation

in the program, if you will.

MISS SONDERGAARD: Is that a question?

MR. TAVENNER: Yes. That is a request for you to give us that information.

MISS SONDERGAARD: There are many things I would like to say in regard to a thing like this, but because you have already branded this kind of a meeting, this kind of an organization, I refuse to answer for the reasons previously stated. I wonder if I could interpolate here the fact that I am the wife of Herbert Biberman, as you asked me before. Herbert Biberman was one of the Hollywood ten who has very recently come out of prison for defending the First Amendment before this committee. In my statement I have said that in 1937 -- May I go on?

MR. WOOD: No.

MISS SONDERGAARD: No? I just wanted that in the record.

MR. WOOD: Any further questions?

MR. TAVENNER: I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

MR. WOOD: Mr. Frazier?

MR. FRAZIER: No questions.

MR. MARGOLIS: May we also file with the committee a more complete statement of the objection or the basis for the refusal to answer these questions, in order that it may be a part of this record?

MR. WOOD: If you have the paper, you may file it with

the committee.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

I object to being called to testify against myself in this hearing. The First and Fifth Amendments and all of the Bill of Rights protect me from any inquisitorial procedure, and I may not be compelled to cooperate with this Committee in producing evidence designed to incriminate me and to drive me from my profession as an actress. The historical origin of the Fifth Amendment is founded in the resistance of the people to attempts to prosecute and persecute individuals because of their beliefs, their speech, their writings, and their associations. Therefore, if despite my objection to being required to testify at all, I am nevertheless compelled to take the stand, I shall exercise the great historical right under the Fifth Amendment to refuse to give answers which may tend to incriminate me in this period of hysteria and political persecution. I claim this as a privilege extended to every American by our Constitution. In defending my rights against self-incrimination and to privacy of belief, I am also trying to prevent the final destruction of our rights to freedom of speech, opinion, and association.

MR. WOOD: The committee will resolve itself into executive session at this point. There will be no further open hearing this afternoon.

(Whereupon, at 4:00 o'clock p.m., the committee met in executive session.)